

AN ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION OF THE SHI'AH BELIEF FROM THEIR ORIGINAL SOURCES

SHI'ISM EXPOSED



A COLLECTION OF BOOKS BY

Dr. Abdur Rahman Ad Dimashqiyah

Abdullah Ibn Muhammad As Salafi

Sulaiman Ibn Salih Al Kharashi



Published by:

Dakwah Corner Publications Sdn. Bhd. (962988-A)
No. 7, Jalan Dato Abdul Aziz, Section 14,
46100 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.
T: +603-7954 1653

Second Published:

2015

Title:

Shi'ism Exposed: An Analytical
Exposition of The Shi'ah Beleif
from Their Original Sources

Author/s:

Dr. Abdur Rahman Ad-
Dimashqiyah, Abdullah Ibn
Muhammad As Salafi,
Sulaiman Ibn Salih Al Kharashi

ISBN:

978-967-5699-33-7

Director:

Farid Ullah Ahmed Hussain

Manager:

Siti Zalina Omar

**Cover Design
& Typesetting:**

Farhana Mohd Din

**For suggestions &
comments,
e-mail us at:**

dakwahcornerpublications@
gmail.com

Printed by:

Fussian Advertising &
Printing Sdn Bhd

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Copyright © 2018 Dakwah Corner Publications Sdn Bhd

*No part of this publication may be produced, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical,
photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the
Publisher.*

Showroom Outlets:

MALAYSIA (HQ) :

Dakwah Corner Bookstore
(M) Sdn Bhd
Petaling Jaya, Selangor D.E.
Tel: +603- 7956 4664

SAUDI ARABIA:

Dawah Corner Bookstore
Hilton Tower, Holy Makkah
Tel: +966 2 5311895

NIGERIA:

Dawah Corner Bookstore
Kaduna
Tel: +08056037779

PHILIPPINES:

Dawah Corner Bookstore
Zamboanga City
Tel: 63 926-5284

Dakwah Corner Bookstore
Ampang Point Shopping
Centre
Tel: +603- 4266 9692

Dakwah Corner Bookstore
Subang Parade
Tel: +603- 5611 9515

Distributed By:

Darussalam Australia,
Australia
Tel: +61 2 9740 7188

Salaam Media
International, Singapore
Tel: +65 63964121

Darussalam Publishers,
USA
Tel: 860-224-2400

Darussalam Books
(London Central Mosque),
UK
Tel: 02077231234



TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Calm Dialogue between Ahlus Sunnah and The Shi'ah

Author's Introduction	12
<hr/>	
CHAPTER ONE	
DOCTRINES OF THE SUNNIS AND SHIAS COMPARED	14
<hr/>	
The Shia Belief about the Qur'ân	14
Samples of "Changed" Verses	17
Al-Khû'i's Attitude toward the Changing of the Qur'ân	20
<hr/>	
CHAPTER TWO	
THE SOURCES OF THE SUNNAH	23
<hr/>	
The Sources of the Sunnah according to the Shias	24
The Meaning of the Word "Shia"	27
The Meaning of the Word "Sunni"	28
The Collection and Recording of the Sunnah	28
<hr/>	
CHAPTER THREE	
PILGRIMAGE TO GRAVES AND TO THE SHRINES OF THE IMAMS	30
<hr/>	
Seeking the Aid of the Imams in Times of Adversity	33
the Swearing of Oaths to Another besides Allah	35

CHAPTER FOUR

ON INFALLIBILITY 36

The Doctrine of the Infallibility of the Imams	38
Another Example of Exaggeration	40
Similarities with the Christians: Atonement and Penance	40
A Response to these Accounts	42
`Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib: Hero of Islam and Pride of all the Muslims	43
What the Prophet's Household said about Shia Extremism	45
Only Hypocrites dislike the Prophet's Household	46

CHAPTER FIVE

THE COMPANIONS OF THE PROPHET 49

The Shias' Position of the Prophet's Companions	50
A continuing Tradition	52
Differences among the Companions	56
Who Started Insulting the Companions?	57

CHAPTER SIX

THE IMAMATE ACCORDING TO THE SHIAS 59

Qur'anic Support for the Imamate was "Distorted"	60
Reviewing the Claim of Designating the Imams	61
Alî's Oath to Abû Bakr and `Umar is Irrefutable Proof	63
A Nation that Passed Away	66
Truth was with `Alî and his Opponents were Wrong	66
The First Conflict was Political	67

CHAPTER SEVEN:

THE MUTUAL LOVE BETWEEN `ALÎ AND THE COMPANIONS 69

The Position Of `Alî's Sons Regarding The Companions	71
--	----

The Bond between the Household of the Prophet and the Companions	72
--	----

The The Unknown Martyrs of Karbala with Al-Husayn	74
Imam Mâlik's Response to the Hatred of the Companions	75

CHAPTER EIGHT

WHO KILLED AL-HUSAYN?	77
-----------------------	----

'Âshûrâ' is an Occasion for Joy, not Grief	79
--	----

The Position of 'Alî and his Sons with respect to their "Shia"	80
--	----

The Position of Prophet's Household on the Shias	83
--	----

CHAPTER NINE

TEMPORARY MARRIAGE	84
--------------------	----

Debate on Temporary Marriage	89
------------------------------	----

CHAPTER TEN

TAQIYYAH (DISSIMULATION)	91
--------------------------	----

The Shia Doctrine of Taqiyyah	92
-------------------------------	----

Zakâtul-Khums: The Charity of the "Fifth"	95
---	----

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE TWELFTH IMAM: THE AL-MAHDÎ	98
--------------------------------	----

The Last of the Imams	100
-----------------------	-----

The Task of Al-Mahdî: the Meting out of Revenge	101
---	-----

No One Shall Bear Another's Burden	102
------------------------------------	-----

The Doctrine of "the Return" Stands in the Way of Reconciliation and Unity	103
--	-----

CHAPTER TWELVE

THE DOCTRINE OF MANIFEST KNOWLEDGE 104
AND OTHER INNOVATIONS

Some other Bid`ahs of the Shias	106
Additions to the Adhân (Prayer Call)	106
Prostration on Clay Tablets	108
Combining Two Prayers	108
Suspension of the Friday Prayer	109

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE SHIAS IN HISTORY 111

Who was behind the Fall of Baghdad?	112
Epilogue	114
The Druze	116
Unity is only with those who Acknowledge Divine Unity	118
Islam is Unified around a Single Doctrine	120
Unity is a Blessing from Allah	120
The Shia Call to the non-Muslims to Accept Islam	122
Shia-Christian Dialogue	122

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE SHIAS TODAY 125

The Fruit of Twisted Beliefs	125
------------------------------	-----

Fundamental Shi'ite Belief

Introduction	130
When did the Shi'ite Sect First Appear?	132
Why are Shi'tes Called 'Rejectionists'?	134
How Many Shi'tes Sects are There?	135
The Belief of Al-Bada' which the Raafidhah believe in	136
What is the Belief of the Rawafidh in relation to the Attributes of Allah	137
What is the Belief of the Rawafidh in relation to the Qur'an that we have today?	138
What is the Belief of the Rawafidh in relation to the Companions of the Prophet (ﷺ)?	141
Common Traits between Jews and Raafidhah	144
What is the Belief of the Rawafidh in relation to their Imams?	147
What is the reality behind the belief of 'Ar-Raj'ah' that the Raafidhah believe in?	150
What is the reality behind the belief of 'At-Tuqyah' that the Raafidhah believe in?	153
What is the reality behind the belief of 'At-Teenah' that the Raafidhah believe in?	155
What is the Belief of the Raafidhah in relation to Sunni Muslims?	156
What is the Belief of the Raafidhah in relation to Mut'ah and what is its virtue?	159
What is the Belief of the Raafidhah in relation to an-Najaf and Karbala? What is the merit of visiting these places according to them?	162

What is the difference between Sunni Muslims and Shi'ites	165
What is the Belief of the Shi'ites in relation to the Aashoorah and what is its merit according to them?	167
What is the Belief of the Shi'ites in relation to the Bai'at (Pledge of Allegiance)?	168
What is the ruling of overlooking the differences between Sunni Muslims and Polytheist Raafidhah?	170
What have the Pious Predecessors said about the Raafidhah?	171
Surat al-Wilayah	176
The Alleged Tablet of Fatimah	179
Du'aa Sanamai Quraish (i.e. the two idols of Quraish)	181
What is meant is Abu Bakr and Umar?	
Conclusion	184

Some Questions that Led Shi'ite Youths to the Truth

Introduction	188
The Unavoidable Questions	189

BOOK ONE

A Calm Dialogue between
Ahlus Sunnah and The Shi'ah

DR. ABDUR RAHMAN AD DIMASHQIYAH

AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

Praise be to Allah, Lord of the worlds. Peace and blessings be upon the most noble of the Messengers, Muhammad,¹ and upon his family and Companions.

I dedicate this paper to every Shia who is willing to listen to constructive criticism with an open heart and an enlightened mind. This research is, in fact, a survey of the literature about the rise and spread of Shiism and its fundamental principles. Much of what follows is taken directly from Shia sources. Details of all the sources I have used are recorded in footnotes where interested readers will find page and volume numbers of the works cited. Anyone who wishes may then refer to the original Shia works and check what I have said.

I would like to stress that I do not intend to imply that every Shia must necessarily believe everything that I have reported about their beliefs and doctrines. My intention is simply to make clear to every Shia what the books of their religious leaders contain. These are things that many people still do not realize. My intention is to maintain an objective position, far from bigotry and blind allegiance to traditions. My only reason for writing it is to earn the pleasure of Allah and to clarify the truth to all who are interested to hear it. We should all free ourselves from prejudice and wild ideas, and avoid making inflammatory and insulting charges that fuel the emotions, block the path to truth, and widen the chasm

1 The blessings on the Prophet, upon whom be peace, will not be repeated in the text, but readers are requested to observe this *Sunnah* whenever his name is mentioned.

between us. These things do nothing but dissipate the spirit of peace and harmony.

I am firmly convinced that we must begin with a sincere commitment to the truth and believe that the struggle between truth and falsehood will continue until the Day of Resurrection. I am also convinced that the truth must be presented without recourse to insults, curses or profanity. Allah has commanded us to observe the highest standards of dignity and self-respect when we argue with the "People of the Book."² Therefore, it is fitting for us to show even more respect to the people of our Book when we come to disagree with them and discuss these disagreements.

I look forward to the day when Allah joins our two communities with His Book and the *Sunnah* of His Messenger. May Allah hasten the day when He binds our hearts together again, after this long and bitter separation that has only benefited the enemies of the Muslims, and given them an ugly advantage from the beginning of our estrangement right up to today.

Shaykh Dr. Abdurahman Ad-Dimashqiyah

² This is a term used to designate the Christians and the Jews, who have a special legal status in Islamic Law. It is a direct translation of the Arabic *Ahlul-Kitâb*, which appears many times in the Glorious Qur'ân.

1

DOCTRINES OF THE SUNNIS AND SHIAS COMPARED

The Sunnis are moderate in their beliefs. They are not fanatics and do not innovate in matters of religion. The Sunni doctrine comes directly from the Qur'ân and the most strongly supported evidence from the *Sunnah* of the Prophet. The Qur'ân is from Allah; He has made it a light, a guide, and evidence of truth for those who worship Him. It contains no errors and is not wanting in any way. The Qur'ân we have today is the same Qur'ân that the Messenger taught us. No one has added anything to it and no one has removed anything from it. Although the enemies of Allah try to twist the Qur'ân and to raise doubts about it, they will always fail since Allah has promised to preserve it as He says in the verse which reads: *{“Indeed, it is We Who sent down the Message [i.e. the Qur'ân] and indeed, We will be its Guardian.”}*¹

The Shia Belief about the Qur'ân

The Shia scholars do state what contradicts this concept of Allah's guarantee to protect the Qur'ân. To illustrate, Hâshim Al-Bahrânî, a *Shi'ite* exegete, in the introduction of his book

1 Qur'ân 15:9.

Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân, the Hadîth scholar Mullâ Bâqir Al-Majlisî in his book *Mir'âtul-'Uqûl (Mirror of Minds)*, Sheikh An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî², Ni'matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî in his book *Al-Anwâr An-Nu'mâniyyah*, and others of Shia scholars, state that the Prophet's Companions made additions to its text, removed parts of it, and changed others. An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî quoted from Ni'matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî that, "The Shia scholars uniformly agree to the authenticity of the recurrent narrations indicating the change in the Qur'ân."³ Al-Kulaynî,⁴ in his book *Al-Kâfî (The Sufficient)* makes the same charge saying that the whole Qur'ân consists of seventeen thousand verses though it is well known that the number of verses in the Qur'ân we all use is somewhere in the neighborhood of six thousand.⁵ Finally, Al-Kulaynî asserts that the

2 An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, *Faslul-Khitab fî Itbbât Tabrîf Kitâb Rabb Al-Arbâb*; see also Al-Sayyid Hâshim Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, p.49; Bâqir Al-Majlisî, *Mir'âtul-'Uqûl*, Ni'matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî, *Al-Anwâr Al-Nu'mâniyyah*, 2:356.

3 An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, *Faslul-Khitâb fî Itbbât Tabrîf Kitâb Rabbul-Al-Arbâb*, p.30.

4 Muhammad Ibn Ya'qûb Ibn Ishâq Al-Kulaynî Ar-Râzî (d.328/939). A principal Shia theologian and scholar [trans]. Al-Kulaynî is the author of the Shias' most authoritative book of *fiqh*, *Al-Kâfî*, which the Shias believe is more reliable than *Sabîh Al-Bukhârî*. Sheikh `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî says that *Al-Kâfî* is the best and most reliable book of the Shia (*Al-Murâja'ât*, pp.110-311). Likewise, Sheikh Muhammad Sâdiq As-Sadr in his book *Ash-Shi'ah (The Shia)* says, "It is said that *Al-Kâfî* was shown to the Mahdî (the Twelfth Imam) who said, "This is sufficient for our faction."

5 In his exegesis of the Qur'ân entitled *As-Sâfî (The Crystal Clear)*, Al-Kâshânî said, "As for Al-Kulaynî, may Allah bless him, he was convinced that [the Companions] had changed the Qur'ân and removed parts of it. He said this in his book *Al-Kâfî* and never failed to defend this position. In the beginning of his book, Al-Kulaynî also mentions that both he and his elder scholar, `Alî Ibn Ibrâhîm Al-Qummî, were convinced by reports of this, and points out that Al-Qummî's commentary on the Qur'ân is "full of such reports." (see Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr As-Sâfî*, 47:1).

complete Qur'ân was only compiled by their Imams.⁶ According to him, Imam Ja'far As-Sâdiq, said, "We have Fâtimah's Qur'ân and by Allah your Qur'ân does not contain a word of it."⁷

Al-Kâshânî says that the Qur'ân we have is not the complete Qur'ân that the Prophet brought.⁸ According to him, the Qur'ân contradicts the Message revealed by Allah. He adds that some parts of it were not changed while other parts were deleted by the hypocrites (he means the Companions of the Prophet) such as deleting the name of 'Alî from the Qur'ân. Al-Kâshânî also said, "...and they also removed the words 'the family of Muhammad' along with some of the hypocrites⁹." He further said, "As for our [Shia's] scholars' belief in this regard, it is clear that Al-Kulaynî believed that the Qur'ân was changed; parts of it were changed and others were removed."¹⁰

An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî is among the most highly revered Shia scholars though he, in his book *Faslul-Khitâb (Decisive Judgment)* lists more than two thousand narrations of changes in the Qur'ân

6 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1:427; The Imams of the Ja'farî, or Imâmiyyah sect, with which this book is principally concerned, are twelve: 'Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, Al-Hasan, Al-Husayn, 'Alî Zayn Al-'Âbidîn Ibnul-Husayn, Muhammad Al-Bâqir Ibn 'Alî, Ja'far As-Sâdiq Ibn Muhammad, Mûsâ Al-Kâzim Ibn Ja'far, 'Alî Ridâ Ibn Mûsâ, Muhammad Al-Jawâd Ibn 'Alî, 'Alî Al-Hâdî Ibn Muhammad, Al-Hasan Al-'Askarî Ibn 'Alî, Al-Mahdî Al-Muntazar (believed to be in occultation), see Sobhî Mahmasânî, *Falsafat At-Tashrî' Al-Islâmî (Jurisprudence of Islamic Legislation)*, p.45) [trans].

7 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1:240.

8 Al-Kâshânî, in his introduction to Al-Kulaynî's *As-Sâfî*.

9 He refers to the Companions by the word «hypocrites».

10 An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, *Faslul-Khitâb fî Itbbât Tabrîf Kitâb Rabb Al-Arbâb*; see also Al-Sayyid Hâshim Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, p.49; Bâqir Al-Majlisî, *Mir'âtul-'Uqûb*, Ni'matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî, *Al-Anwâr Al-Nu'mâniyyah*, 2:356.

that he collected from a wide range of Shia books, among them Al-Kulaynî's Al-Kâfi. In reward for this the Shias buried him in their most sacred cemetery Al-Hujrah Al-Murtadawiyah (i.e the Room of Al-Murtadâ), at An-Najaf in Iraq.

Lastly, Kamâlud-Dîn Maytham Al-Bahrânî tells us in his commentary on Nahjul-Balâghah (Method of Eloquence) that Uthmân Ibn `Affân "collected the Qur`ân according to the way of recitation of Zayd Ibn Thâbit, then he burned all the other copies, throwing out what was a doubtless part of the Qur`ân"¹¹

Samples of "Changed" Verses

Al-Kulaynî and `Alî Ibn Ibrâhîm Al-Qummî¹² assert that the Companions changed many verses of the Qur`ân. They give us examples of some of these, (the words that are asserted to have been removed are set in italics).

- ❑ And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger *in the Imamate of `Alî and the Imams who succeed him* has certainly attained a great attainment.¹³

11 `Abdul-Hamîd Ibn Hibatul-Lâh Al-Madâ'inî Ibnul-Hadîd (d.586/1190), *Sharh Nahjul- Balâghah (Explaining the Method of Eloquence)*, 1:11 (Iran), a commentary on a collection of sayings attributed to `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, may Allah be pleased with him.

12 `Alî Ibn Ibrâhîm Ibn Hâshim Al-Qummî, hereinafter referred to simply as "Al-Qummî," was a Shia exegete of the Qur`ân who lived in the fourth century after Hijrah. He is not to be confused with the *faqîh* Abû Ja`far Muhammad Ibn `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn Mûsâ Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî As-Sâdiq, herein referred to as Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî (d. 381 h.), author of the book *`Uyûn Akhbâr Ar-Ridâ (Top Narratives of Ar-Ridâ)* [trans].

13 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfi*, 1: 414.

- ❑ A supplicant asked for a punishment bound to happen - To the disbelievers; in the Imamate of `Alî of it there is no preventer.¹⁴
- ❑ And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down [i.e. the Qur'ân] upon Our Servant [i.e. Prophet Muhammad] concerning the Imamate of `Alî...¹⁵
- ❑ And those who have wronged the family of Muhammad are going to know to what [kind of] return they will be returned.
- ❑ You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. .., Commenting on this verse, Al-Qummî relates that Abû `Abdullâh said "Those who killed Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind?" Someone asked him, "Then what did the Qur'ân really say?" He said, "You are the best Imams produced [as an example] for mankind?"¹⁶
- ❑ But if they had done what they were instructed *in the matter of `Alî*.
- ❑ "O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, *in the matter of `Alî* and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message." Commenting on this

14 Ibid. 1:417.

15 Ibid. 1:417.

16 This "interpretation" depends upon a rereading of one word in the Arabic original. The Arabic reads "*Kuntum khaira ummatin ukhrijat lin-nâs.*" To support the interpretation reported above it is necessary to read "*Kuntum khaira a'immatin ukhrijat lin-nâs.*" The substitution is the word *a'immah* (Imams) for *ummah* (nation). These words sound similar and are spelled similarly [*trans*].

verse, Al-Qummî said, "When Allah revealed this verse, the Prophet told 'Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, "Had I not conveyed what I had been ordered to convey about your succession (Imamate), my deeds would have been in vain."¹⁷

These are a few of the verses that the Shias accuse the Companions of changing. They do not seem to realize that this raises doubts about the Qur'ân since Allah says, {"Indeed, it is We Who sent down the Message [i.e. the Qur'ân] and indeed, We will be its Guardian."}¹⁸ This means that Allah will preserve the Qur'ân, protect it, and prevent anyone from changing it.

Shah Muhammad,¹⁹ a Qajar ruler of Iran, once asked Sheikh 'Alî Asghar Barjardî to write a book and explain clearly the beliefs of the Shias. In this book, called *The Doctrines of the Shias*,²⁰ Barjardî explains that "We must believe that it is impossible to change the original Qur'ân, but the hypocrites [he means the Companions] both added things to the Qur'ân we have, and took things out of it. The original Qur'ân is with the Imam of the Age,²¹ may Allah hasten his return."²²

17 *Tafsîr Nûrul-Thaqalayn*.

18 Qur'ân 15:9.

19 Shah Muhammad, ruled 1193/1779-1212/1797, first Shah of the Qajar dynasty of Iran. They were Turkmens of the Qajar tribe overthrown by Reza Khan, the father of the last Shah of Iran, Muhammad Reza, in 1924 [*trans*].

20 'Alî Asghar Barjardî, *'Aqâ'id Ash-Shi'ah*.

21 This refers to the Twelfth Imam who the Shias say disappeared into a cave a thousand years ago [*trans*].

22 'Alî Asghar Barjardî, *'Aqâ'id Ash-Shi'ah*, p.27.

There are some sincere Shias who reject this doctrine, but since they reject this part of Shia belief, why do they still blindly follow the rest of it? Why do they not condemn these heretical scholars and abandon Shiism? Merely denouncing their ideas while still following their sect is not enough. To stay in a sect founded in error is to stay in error. Many Christians deny the doctrine of the Trinity and reject the cult of saints. Many of them do not believe in the divinity of human beings, but they still associate themselves with a religion that fails to convince them. Surely, they are only following the traditions of their ancestors.

Since most ordinary Shias have rejected the belief of distorting the Qur'ân, their sheikhs have become obliged to deny this shameful idea. But if they were sincere about this, they would admit what such books contain, for these books, which they regularly reprint, usually find their way into the hands of ordinary Muslims. In such books we can find many narrations that support the idea of changing the Qur'ân. This idea is greatly considered by Shia scholars and prominent figures as it is stated in their main references, such as *Al-Kâfi*.

Al-Khû'î's Attitude toward the Changing of the Qur'ân

There is a group of Shias who dissociate themselves from the belief that the Companions changed the Qur'ân. These follow Imam Al-Khû'î, a prominent scholar, who is the director of Al-Hawzah Al-'Ilmiyyah based at An-Najaf. He passed a ruling to prohibit this belief. While they say they follow him alone, they still overlook two points:

1 Al-Khû'î is not a prominent figure in comparison with such scholars as Al-Kulaynî, Al-Qummî, Al-Majlisî, and other Shia scholars.²³ The primary Shia references are still the books of major Shia scholars, all of which contain references to this belief while they are the main sources for students and scholars alike. So let Al-Khû'î talk on behalf of them and admit that the books of such prominent Shia scholars stated that the Qur'ân was changed; otherwise, he would be concealing testimony.

2 After considering all the views about the authenticity of the Qur'ân, Al-Khû'î says, "Clearly the story about how the Companions changed the Qur'ân is nothing but a fairy tale; only the feeble-minded could believe it."²⁴

Nevertheless, Al-Khû'î himself still has an opinion, which somehow resembles some of such "fairy tales". In the very book in which he rejected the idea of changing the Qur'ân, he says that, "There is a "Qur'ân of `Alî; the order of the chapters of this Qur'ân is different from the one present nowadays, and its existence is a fact that one should not doubt. Shia scholars are all agreed on the existence of `Alî's Qur'ân; and this consensus has sufficed us to undertake the effort to prove it. Having additions which do not appear in the present Qur'ân – even if this opinion is right – is not sufficient evidence to prove that such additions were part of the Qur'ân and were removed through distortion. The preponderant opinion is that the additions in `Alî's Qur'ân are only meant to explain and interpret the text. It also may be included under interpretations

23 Muhammad Al-Bâqir Ibn Muhammad At-Taqiyy Ibn Maqṣûd `Alî Akmal Al-Majlisî Al-Isfâhânî (1110/ 1700). *Hadîth* scholar and theologian, author of numerous works including *Bihâr Al-Anwâr* (*Seas of Lights*) and *Mir'âtul-'Uqûl* (*Mirrors of Minds*) [trans].

24 Al-Khû'î, *Al-Bayân fî Tafṣîr Al-Qur'ân*, p.259.

revealed by Allah to explain Qur'anic verses.” Here Al-Khú'î confirms two things:

First, there is another Qur'ân, “`Alî's Qur'ân,” which is different from the Qur'ân that Muslims have today in content and in chapter arrangement.

Second, Allah revealed the Qur'ân and explained its meaning.

Can anyone believe that Allah revealed the Qur'ân with explanations of its meanings? From a scholar, Al-Khú'î, who is known for being reasonable, such declarations are astonishing. Why should we not join in a common belief, one that is clear and honest? Why should we not all recognize that the Qur'ân, that is with us and in our mosques, is the same Qur'ân that Muhammad taught us, which is free of additions and omissions? When will we finish with this talk of a hidden Qur'ân with the Invisible Imam, about Fâtimah's Qur'ân and `Alî's Qur'ân? If we cannot agree on this, then how will our two communities ever find any common ground? And how could we possibly agree about anything else.



2

SOURCES OF THE SUNNAH

According to Sunni Muslims, the *Sunnah* of the Prophet is the second main source of legislation after the Qur'ân. This relates to the sayings and actions of the Prophet reported in the Prophet's *hadîth*,¹ and includes explanations of the Qur'ân. The Prophet said, "Adhere strictly to my *Sunnah*."² It is, therefore, sufficient honor for Sunni Muslims to be attributed to Prophet's *Sunnah* (by being called *Ahlus-Sunnah*).³

Sunni Muslims use two primary *hadîth* references; these are the collections of Imams Al-Bukhârî and Muslim. There are also several other collections of *hadîths* that include weak reports as well as authentic, or confirmed narrations. Examples of these are Imam Ahmad's Musnad, the books called Sunan of Abû Dâwûd, At-Tirmidhî, At-Tabarânî, and Ibn Mâjah, Ibn Hibbân's *Sahîh*, and Imam Mâlik's *Muwatta'*. Since these books contain reports that are not always well supported, it is necessary to confirm the

1 *Hadîth*: The term refers to all that is narrated from the Prophet (ﷺ): his acts, his sayings, and whatever he approved, in addition to all the reports which describe his physical attributes and character. [trans].

2 Al-Albânî, *Silsilat Al-Ahâdîth As-Sahîbah* (The Collection of Authentic Hadîths), p.361.

3 A commonly used term that means "the Adherents of the *Sunnah* and Muslim Community" and refers to "Sunni Muslims" [trans].

reliability of narrations quoted from them. This is done by critically examining the *isnâd*, i.e. chain of transmission.⁴ It is not enough to say simply, “Abû Dâwûd reported it.” One must go further and prove that the narration is authentic. This is not, however, the case with the collections of Al-Bukhârî and Muslim. These have been critically examined and everything in them is reliable.

The Sources of the Sunnah according to the Shias

The Shias do not depend upon the hadîth references used by the Sunnis like Al-Bukhârî and Muslim. They have their own collections that they believe are more reliable than those of the Sunnis since the narrations they contain are attributed to the Imams of the “Household of the Prophet.” For them, any narration must meet several conditions before they accept it. The following are among these:

- 1 The narrators who report it must be belonging to the Imâmiyyah (Duodecimal Imamate, or Twelve-Imam Shias). They must also be upright in character and trustworthy.
- 2 Its chain of transmission must be traced back to one of the “infallible” Imams.

The Zaydite Shias [Az-Zaydiyyah] disagree with the Twelve-Imam Shias about this and accept hadîth from any upright and trustworthy source, even if it is not related by one belonging to the Twelve-Imam Shias.

4 A commonly used term that means “the Adherents of the *Sunnah* and Muslim Community” and refers to “Sunni Muslims” [*trans*].

Still, Shia sources contain many contradictions concerning the trustworthiness of their narrators. For example, we find `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî, a well-known source on Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq, defending Zurârah Ibn A`yan saying, "We find no reason to criticize him. Only profligate and malicious people could find fault with him."⁵ But other of their books assert that Imam Ja`far himself said "Zurârah has attributed lies to me," and added, "May Allah curse Zurârah, may Allah curse Zurârah, may Allah curse Zurârah." It is also reported that Imam Ja`far said, "If Zurârah falls ill, do not visit him, and when he dies, do not witness his funeral. Zurârah is worse than a Jew or a Christian," and "Surely, Allah has turned Zurârah's heart upside down."⁶

`Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî also says about Hishâm Ibnul-Hakam, "Those who wanted to extinguish the light of Allah accused him of believing in anthropomorphism (the doctrine that likens Allah to human beings), out of jealousy and envy for the Household of the Prophet,⁷ and in enmity towards them. We are best aware of his teachings."⁸ Yet, Al-Kulaynî, As-Sadûq and At-Tubrasî all report from him what affirms his believing in anthropomorphism.⁹ This represents a flat contradiction in the way they assess the reliability of hadîth narrations.¹⁰

5 `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî, *Al-Murâja`ât*, p.110.

6 See Al-Kâshî [Al-Kâshânî], *Rijâl*, pp. 146, 160; Al-Mamaqanî, *Tanqîh Al-Maqâl*, 1:443,444; Al-Khû`î, *Mu`jam Rijâl Al-Hadîth (Dictionary of Hadîth Narrators)*.

7 *Ahlul-Bayt*, see Chapter Four, fn. 28.

8 `Abdul-Husayn Al-Mûsawî, *Al-Murâji`ât*, p. 312.

9 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, 1:104, 106; At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj `Alâ Ahl Al-Lijâj*, 2: 155; As-Sadûq, *At-Tawhîd*.

10 For more detailed information on this subject, see Az-Zar`î, *Rijâl Ash-Shi`ah fil-Mizân*, and the book, *Al-Bayanât fî Abâtîl Al-Murâja`ât*.

For more illustration, see *Az-Zar`î's Rijâl Ash-Shi`ah fî Al-Mîzân (Shia Narrators in the Balance)*.

Shias prefer to describe themselves with the word shia, which indicates exclusive and sectarian mentality, to the word “*Sunnah*” which indicates following a constant method among all Muslims, and means to act according to the Prophet’s Tradition. Shia sources, as well, stress the importance of following the Prophet’s *Sunnah*. Al-Kulaynî says in his book, *Al-Kâfî* that whoever rejects anything from the Book of Allah or the *Sunnah* of His Prophet has declared his disbelief in Islam.¹¹

It is narrated that `Alî said, “We are required to act according to the Book of Allah and the example of the Prophet, and to cling to his *Sunnah*.”¹²

At-Tubrasî reports in his book *Al-Ihtijâj* that the Prophet said, “Whenever a *hadîth* is reported to you, refer it to the Book of Allah and my *Sunnah*.”¹³

Why should we not all identify ourselves with the path of the Prophet and his *Sunnah*? Surely, this is sufficiently honorable for all of us and more fitting than the word “*shia*” with its feeling of sectarianism and factionalism, as Allah has said:

*{...and do not be of those who associate others with Allah - [Or] of those who have divided their religion and become sects [shia], every faction rejoicing of what it has.}*¹⁴

11 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Uṣūl min Al-Kâfî*, 1:59, 70.

12 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2: 82.

13 Radî Ad-Dîn At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj `alâ Ahl Al-Lijâj*, p. 222.

14 Qur’ân 30: 31-32.

And Allah also says,

*{Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects [shia] - you, [O Muhammad], are not [associated] with them in anything. Their affair is only [left] to Allah; then He will inform them about what they used to do.}*¹⁵

The Meaning of the Word “Shia”

The word shia was first used as a description for the two factions that arose because of the dispute between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah. These were known as the “*shia*” or faction of `Alî and the “*shia*” of Mu`âwiyah, in the sense of supporters. The term should have fallen out of use once the conflict between them was resolved.

The word **shia** applies today to a group who are independent of the Sunnis in terms of doctrines, jurisprudence, principles of Islamic jurisprudence, and the way of understanding Islam. The original “*shia* of `Alî” were in fact Sunnis in terms of doctrine and religion. There is no rational Sunni Muslim who knows about these events yet does not believe that truth was with `Alî and that Mu`âwiyah and his supporters wronged `Alî. Sunnis believe that those who died defending `Alî’s right were, Allah willing, martyrs. Whoever differs with this view has differed with what the Prophet himself has taught us.

Contemporary Shias have their origin in the Shias of Kufa,¹⁶ who defied the Commander of the Faithful, `Alî, as Al-Murtadâ

15 Qur’ân 6:159.

16 We will return to a discussion of `Alî’s position with regard to the people of Kufa later.

reports in *Nahjul-Balâghah*, “You were called to *jihad* (fighting in the Cause of Allah) but you did not go,” said `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, “you were called to obedience but you did not obey. Would that I had never seen you and never known you, may Allah strike you down. You have filled my heart with rage. Would that Allah separate me from you and grant me more worthy companions than you. O Allah, I have grown weary of them and they of me. I have vexed them and they me. Grant me better company than them, and grant them [a leader] less than me.”¹⁷

The Meaning of the Word “Sunni”

The word ***sunni*** has always symbolized a commitment to following the *Sunnah* of the Prophet, rather than the traditional loyalties of any particular group. No one can rightly be called “*Sunni*” except someone who is committed, above everything else, to following the guidance of the Prophet’s example in every way. Some people may be called “*Sunnis*” but do not perform prayer, do not fast, and do not follow anything of the *Sunnah*. Such people are not following the *Sunnah* and so cannot be called *Sunnis*, even if the words “*Sunni Muslim*” are written on their birth certificates.

The Collection and Recording of the Sunnah

Who really collected the information we have about the *Sunnah* and passed it down to us? Some of the Shias claim that it was the Twelve Imams of the Shias who did this, but this is far from the truth.

17 We will return to a discussion of `Alî’s position with regard to the people of Kufa later.

When Allah revealed the verse {*...This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favor upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion...*}¹⁸, both Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn were still small boys. As for the nine other Imams, they had not even been born yet. Naturally, those who reported and preserved all we know about the *Sunnah* and taught it to the people were the Companions of the Prophet. Certainly this group includes his wives,¹⁹ `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, Al-`Abbâs, Abû Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthmân.



18 Qur'ân 5:3.

19 *Ahlul-Bayt*, see Chapter Four, fn.28.

3

**PILGRIMAGE TO GRAVES
AND TO THE SHRINES OF IMAMS**

Sunni Muslims follow the instructions of the Prophet who said, “Allah has cursed the Jews and the Christians for taking the graves of their Prophets and righteous men as places of worship. Do not make the graves of your prophets into mosques, for I forbid you from this.”¹ Out of fear from falling into disbelief, they have been careful to avoid any resemblance to the Christians and the Jews. In another matter, they are also careful to follow the Prophet’s orders. He said, “If you ask for anything, then ask Allah, and if you seek help, then seek help from Allah.”² Therefore, they address their prayers and supplications to Allah Alone. They do not visit the graves of the dead to ask their favors instead of praying to the Ever-Living God Who does not die, by Whose Hand Alone both harm and benefit come.

As for the Shias, it is a normal thing for them to visit the graves of their Imams and give money to the custodians of these tombs. All of them approve of this. One of their scholars, Sheikh Al-Mufid, tells us in his book *Al-Irshâd (Guidance)* that “...just one visit to the

1 Al-Bukhârî, Muslim, An-Nasâ’î, and Mâlik.

2 At-Tirmidhî; Al-Albânî confirms that it is *sahîh* (authentic) in his edition of *Mishkât Al- Masâbîh*.

grave of Al-Husayn is like performing Hajj (Pilgrimage) a hundred times and performing 'Umrah (Minor Pilgrimage) a hundred times; whoever visits Al-Husayn's grave is assured Paradise.³ He also says, "Whoever visits the graves of the Prophet's Household is protected by Allah from the Hellfire and surely will admit him to Paradise."⁴

The Shias, thus, have invented *hadīths* to describe the merits of visiting these shrines and weeping therein as well as reciting special prayers that have been invented for the purpose of these visits. Certainly such things would not have been accepted by any member of the Prophet's Household neither would they have liked what Ibn Bābawayh Al-Qummī said that whoever visits the grave of Imam Ja'far As-Sādiq or Imam Al-Husayn, has the reward of seventy Pilgrimages, or that to spend the night at Al-Husayn's grave is like visiting Allah's Throne.⁵ Moreover, he tells us that Allah Himself visits the grave of 'Alī, as do the Prophets and the believers.⁶ Is it possible that people will still be eager to visit Al-Masjid Al-Harām (the Sacred Mosque) at Mecca if visiting the graves of the Imams is more important and brings a greater reward? This is why they encourage one another to fill their mosques with graves and to build new shrines. A shrine or a grave, they believe, is a more fitting place for worship than a mere mosque.

3 Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn An-Nu'mān Ibn 'Abdus-Salām Al-'Ukbarī Al-'Arabī Al-Hārītī Al-Baghdādī Al-Mufīd Ibnul-Mu'allim (d. 413/1022), *Al-Irshād fī Ma'rifat Hujaj Allāh 'alā Al-'Ibād*, 252; also 'Abdullāh Al-Ansārī, *Ma'a Al-Khatīb fī Khutūtib Al-'Arīdah*, 81.

4 Ibn Bābawayh Al-Qummī, *Uyūn Akhbār Ar-Ridā*, 255; also Al-Ansārī, op. cit., p.18.

5 Ibn Bābawayh Al-Qummī, *Uyūn Akhbār Ar-Ridā*, 2:259; Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan At-Tūsī, Sheikh At-Tā'ifāh (d. 459/1917), *Tabdhīb Al-Ahkām (Abridging Rulings)*, 6:51; Al-Majlisī, *Bihār Al-Anwār*, pp.101, 105.

6 Al-Majlisī, *Bihār Al-Anwār*, pp. 100, 257.

Today the Shias' attention is constantly drawn to the graveyard and the sepulcher. They kiss the walls of tombs, hang money on them, and address their private prayers to the dead. New graveyards crowd the precincts of old shrines as they believe that whoever is buried near the shrine of an Imam will be protected from the punishment in the grave and on the Day of Resurrection, a door will be opened for him to Paradise. Thus, there is a clear resemblance between this and the beliefs and practices of the Jews and the Christians. These are the same practices for which Allah has cursed the "People of the Book."

While the Shias remain opposed to the use of Qiyâs (Analogical Deduction)⁷, this does not prevent them from making an analogy between the kissing and caressing of the tombs of the Imams and the kissing of the Black Stone at Mecca. But while it is an act of the *Sunnah* to kiss the Black Stone, this cannot apply to tombs. The Companions of the Prophet did not do such things. `Alî did not kiss the tombs of the Prophet and his household, or hang from the walls and doors of shrines like those who claim to follow him do today.

Any rational person will see that what the Shias and the Sufis do at the graves of Imams and righteous people throughout the Islamic world is just like what the Christians do at their shrines and monasteries where they seek the blessings of statutes of Christ and Mary. Buddhists and Hindus also do the same thing at their temples, and do not neglect to kiss the doors and wail as they present their offerings of food and money and ask for the favors of the dead rather than of the Ever-Living One Who never dies.

7 A secondary principle of Islamic jurisprudence; it is the process of passing a judgment upon a certain issue on the basis of another one due to similar features common between them.

As for the Sunnis, they have maintained a moderate position between those who curse the Prophet's Household and those who exaggerate their love for them through seeking their help, travel aiming their graves, considering that visiting such graves are of more reward than visiting the Sacred Mosque. The Sunnis deny that the dead can intermediate between the worshiper and his Lord. A mosque and a grave are two things that can never be confused in the mind of a true Muslim who devotes his worship to Allah. Allah has said, *{“And [He revealed] that the masjids are for Allah, so do not invoke with Allah anyone.”}*⁸ Not only is it the height of idiocy, but it is also disbelief to go to the mosque and say “O Allah!” and then a little later go to a grave and say “O `Alî, O Al-Husayn!” If visiting the grave of one of the Imams was equal to performing *Hajj* a hundred times, then why would a visit to the grave of Allah's Messenger not be equal to this, or more? Why do they insist so much upon the Prophet's Household while neglecting the Prophet himself? Is their love for his family greater than their love for him?

Seeking the Aid of the Imams in Times of Adversity

The Sunnis believe that love for Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn is something that pleases Allah and is obligatory on every Muslim. Imam Ash-Shâfi`î points out, however, that the Shias' habit of calling on Al-Husayn and others, saying such things as “O `Alî, O Al-Husayn, O Mahdî, O Master of the Age,” is wrong. The naming of children `Abdul-Husayn (servant of Al-Husayn) and `Abdul-Hasan (servant of Al-Hasan) is also contrary to the *Shari`ah*. The Sunni Muslims see this in the same light as they see the Christians'

8 Qur'ân 72:18.

naming of their sons `Abdul-Masih.⁹ Jesus and Al-Husayn were both servants of Allah. The best names are those that express submission to Allah, such as `Abdullâh (servant of Allah) and `Abdur-Rahmân (servant of the Most Beneficent). These names include the Divine Qualities and Attributes of Allah and remind us of the worship and devotion that are due only to Allah. Whoever replaces one of Allah's Divine Names with the name of another has directed an act of worship to another beside Allah. The Sunnis, on the other hand, address their personal and private prayers to Allah Alone. They long for His help Alone in times of adversity. They love the Household of the Prophet but do not make them into saints and minor deities. [True] Muslims represent a middle way, between the Jews, who totally denied Jesus, and the belief of the Christians who worship him. Likewise, true Muslims take a middle position between those who curse the Household of Prophet and those who worship them and raise them up above the Prophets.

Thus, the Sunnis call upon Allah Alone, for He is nearer to them than their jugular vein. Whenever they call upon Him, He hears the call of all who worship Him. He hears them all wherever they are. He is All-Merciful, quick to respond and totally aware of the needs of His worshipers, even when they do not appeal to Him for help. Allah says:

{Say, "Shall we invoke instead of Allah that which neither benefits us nor harms us and be turned back on our heels after Allah has guided us?"}¹⁰

9 "Servant of the Messiah", this is a name used by Arab Christians [*trans*].

10 Qur'ân 6:71.

The Swearing of Oaths to Another besides Allah

Sunnis believe that taking oaths by the Prophet's Household other than Allah is an act of polytheism. The Prophet warned us about this and said, "Whoever swears by other than Allah is committing an act of polytheism."¹¹ In another hadîth, the Prophet said, "Whoever swears an oath must swear by Allah or otherwise keep quiet."¹² Christians do this too, and swear by Jesus rather than by Allah.



11 At-Tirmidhî, chapter of *An-Nudbûr wa Al-Aymân (Vows and Oaths)*; it is narrated through an authentic chain of transmission.

12 Al-Bukhârî, Muslim, At-Tirmidhî, Abû Dâwûd, and An-Nasâ'î.

4

 ON INFALLIBILITY

The Sunnis acknowledge the merits of the House of the Prophet and the correctness of their religion, but they do not say they were infallible, for every human being is prone to error. No one is exempted from error, which is a quality of human nature. The Prophet pointed this out when he said, “Man is liable to mistake, and the best of those who do are those who turn to Allah in repentance.”¹ While the Prophets infallibly convey the Revelation, their infallibility does not extend beyond this. How many Prophets have been admonished by Allah, and on occasions corrected? Allah mildly reproved the Prophet in a well-known Chapter of the Qur’ân, saying:

{“He [i.e. the Prophet] frowned and turned away - Because there came to him the blind man, [interrupting]. But what would make you perceive, [O Muhammad], that perhaps he might be purified - Or be reminded and the remembrance would benefit him? As for he who thinks himself without need, - To him you give attention. And not upon you [is any blame] if he will not be purified. But as for he who came

1 At-Tirmidhî, Ibn Mâjah and Ad-Dârimî, it is narrated with a good chain of transmission; Ibnul-Athîr, *Jâmi` Al-Usûl min Abâdîth Ar-Rasûl*, 2:515. (*The Collection of Prophetic Hadîths Sources*).

*to you striving [for knowledge] - While he fears [Allah],
- From him you are distracted. No! Indeed, they [i.e. these
verses] are a reminder...}*²

On another occasion, Allah tells Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ):

*{May Allah pardon you, [O Muhammad]; why did you give
them permission [to remain behind]? [You should not have]
until it was evident to you who were truthful and you knew
[who were] the liars.}*³

Allah also says addressing the Prophet, *{“...while you concealed
within yourself that which Allah is to disclose. And you **feared the
people**, while Allah has more right that you fear Him...”}*⁴

There are other examples in the Qur’ân which confirm the
fact that Prophets’ infallibility does not extend beyond conveying
Revelation. An example of this is the verse that reads, *{“[Noah]
said, “My Lord, I seek refuge with You from asking that of which I
have no knowledge. And unless You **forgive me** and have mercy upon
me, I will be among the losers.”}*⁵

And in another verse Prophet Ibrâhîm (Abraham) (عليه السلام) says,
*{“And Who I aspire that He will forgive me **my sin** on the Day
of Recompense.”}*⁶

2 Qur’ân 80:1-11.

3 Qur’ân 9:43.

4 Qur’ân 33:37.

5 Qur’ân 11:47.

6 Qur’ân 26:82.

Allah also tells about Yûnus (Jonah),

*{“And [mention] the man of the fish [i.e. Jonah], when he went off in anger and thought that We would not decree [anything] upon him. And he called out within the darknesses, “There is no deity except You; Exalted are You. Indeed, I have been of the wrongdoers.”}*⁷

The Doctrine of the Infallibility of the Imams

The Shias believe their Imams are infallible in every respect. They see only a superficial distinction between the status of an Imam and that of a Prophet. In his book *Bihâr Al-Anwâr* (under the chapter entitled “Imams are more Knowledgeable than Prophets”), Al-Majlisî says, “We do not admit any difference between the concept of the Prophethood and that of the Imamate.”⁸ Sheikh Muhammad Ridâ Al-Mudhaffar says, “We believe the Imam, like the Prophet, must be free from all forms of corruption and vice, what is apparent of them and what is concealed, whether committed deliberately or neglectfully, from the time of infancy until death. Likewise, an Imam must be free from absentmindedness, forgetfulness and error.”⁹

Because of the “infallibility” of their Imams, Shia scholars, including Imam Khomeini, believe their Imams’ teachings have the same status as the Qur’ân. This is because the Imams are “above forgetfulness.”¹⁰

7 Qur’ân 21: 87

8 Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 26:82; and Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfi*, 21:260-263.

9 Muhammad Ridâ Al-Mudhaffar, *‘Aqâ'id Al-Imamîyah*, 95.

10 Ayatollah Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah* (Islamic Government),

It is sufficient to have a glance through the contents of Al-Kulaynî's *Al-Kâfî* to be acquainted with this idea; Al-Kulaynî says in the table of contents:

- ☐ The Imams have all of the knowledge that was given to the Prophets and the Angels.
- ☐ The Imams know when they will die and they only die at the time of their own choice.
- ☐ The Imams know all that was and all that is and all that may have been but was not; nothing is hidden from them.¹¹
- ☐ The Imams know all the revealed books in the languages that they were revealed.
- ☐ When Imams have the upper hand, they will judge as Prophet Dâwûd (David) (عليه السلام) used to do; they should not be questioned about the evidences of their judgments.
- ☐ None collected all the Qur'ân but the Imams.
- ☐ The only truth known to human beings is that which has been brought to them by the Imams, anything not coming directly from them is falsehood.
- ☐ The Earth is entirely in the hands of the Imam.

pp. 91, 113.

11 Khomeini says, "We do not imagine that the Imams could be forgetful or neglectful of anything, we believe that they encompass entirely the well-being of the Muslims."

Another Example of Exaggeration

In his book, *Hayâtul-Qulûb (Life of Hearts)*, Al-Majlisî writes that the Prophet was once sitting while Al-Husayn was on his right thigh and his son Ibrâhîm on his left thigh. He would kiss this one and then that one. The Angel Jibrîl (Gabriel) was sent down and said, "Verily, your lord has sent me to tell you that they cannot live at the same time; choose one of them over the other, and sacrifice the second to the first." The Prophet looked at his son Ibrâhîm and wept. Then he said to Jibrîl, "I have sacrificed Ibrâhîm for Al-Husayn, and am content with the death of Ibrâhîm so that Al-Husayn may live and prosper."¹²

Similarities with the Christians: Atonement and Penance

The Shias' exaggerations about their Imams have led them to believe that loyalty toward the Imams is more important than prayer, Fasting, giving *Zakâh*, and Pilgrimage to Mecca. Al-Kulaynî tells us that Abû Ja'far said, "Islam is built on five things: Prayer, *Zakâh*, Hajj, Fasting, and loyalty toward the Prophet's Household."¹³ Someone asked him, "Which of these is the most important?" He said, "Loyalty toward the Prophet's Household."¹⁴

The Shia scholars say that whoever declares his allegiance to the Prophet's Household is among the people of Paradise. It does

12 Al-Majlisî, *Hayâtul-Qulûb*, 2:593.

13 In Shia books, this is called *wilayat* [trans].

14 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 2:18-20; also Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 68:83-97 (the chapter is entitled, "No Deeds are Accepted except by Loyalty to the Prophet's Household").

not matter what he has done in this world. Further, they claim that Imam Ja'far As-Sâdiq said, "Allah had written a book two thousand years before He created all things and it remains with Him beneath the Throne. (It says) 'O Shias of the Family of Muhammad, I have forgiven you even before you have disobeyed Me. Whoever comes without having denied the Imamate of Muhammad's Household, I will admit him to Paradise, a mercy from Me.'"¹⁵ The Shias have fabricated *hadîths* indicating their superiority over other people. They claim that Allah created them from special clay, different from the clay all other human beings were made from. They went further claiming that Allah will not forgive anyone other than them and that they are the successful people on the Day of Resurrection.¹⁶

According to them, Imam Ja'far As-Sâdiq said, "Allah has created us from the highest degree in Paradise and has also created the souls of our Shias from the highest degree in Paradise."¹⁷ Fathul-Lâh Al-Kâshânî says in his book *Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn (Way of the Truthful)* that "the love for 'Alî is a virtuous deed¹⁸ that no wrong doing can wipe away.

. . . Our love for the Household of the Prophet causes sins to fall like the leaves fall from a tree."¹⁹ Al-Kulaynî says in *Al-Kâfî*, "The pen is lifted up (i.e., no deed, good or evil is recorded...)"²⁰ from

15 Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân* 3:228.

16 Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 68:1-83; also 98-149 and 149-199.

17 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 3:4; Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 52:12.

18 Arabic: *hasanah* [trans].

19 Fathul-Lâh Ibn Shukrul-Lâh Al-Kâshânî (d.978/1570), *Minhaj As-Sâdiqîn fî Ilzâm Al-Mukhâlifîn*, 8:110.

20 *Rufî'a al-qalam* is an Arabic idiom that means to be "unaccountable for one's sins," it appears in a well-known *hadîth* where the Prophet said "*Rufî'a al-qalam 'an* ..." "No deed, good or evil is recorded for the insane until they

our Shias, even if they come with as many sins as there are drops of rain, or pebbles.”²¹ In the introduction to *Tafsîr Al-Burhân*, we are told that Allah said, “‘Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is My Proof to My creation. Whoever acknowledges this will not enter the Hellfire, even if he disobeyed Me, and no one will enter Paradise who denies this, even if he obeyed Me.”²² Finally, it is narrated that when a man told one of the Imams, “I love those who observe fasting but I do not fast, and I love those who observe prayer but I do not perform prayer.” The Imam said, “You will be with those whom you love.”²³

A Response to these Accounts

If it is true that the mere love for Imams is an act of piety that cannot be wiped out by any sin, then what need is there to observe anything else in the *Sharî'ah*? Is the love for ‘Alî and the Imams more important to Allah than obedience to Him and fulfilling the obligations of His religion? If the mere love for Allah and His Messenger is not enough to protect the believer from chastisement, how could the love for ‘Alî alone, unsupported by any good deeds, not only save him from all punishment, but wipe out all his evil deeds? This belief diverts people from the principal purpose for which Allah created them and makes the love for ‘Alî, not the worship of Allah, the object of all creation. Allah has created us to do good deeds; He says, {“[He] Who created death and life to test

come to reason, for a child until he comes of age, or for the sleeper until he awakes.” [trans].

21 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*.

22 Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur’ân*, 1:23.

23 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, p.8.

*you [as to] which of you is best in deed...}*²⁴

‘Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib: Hero of Islam and Pride of all the Muslims

According to the Sunnis, ‘Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, the husband of Fâtimah, the father of Al- Hasan and Al-Husayn, was the hero of the Muslims and the source of their pride and self-respect. He was one of the greatest sons of Islam and a defender of the Prophet, even from an early age. To love him and his family is an important aspect of faith, to disparage them is an act of hypocrisy.

Yet, they (the Sunnis) do not agree with the Shias when they say that mere love for ‘Alî will wipe away sin, while no amount of good deeds can make up for hatred toward him. The Sunnis also do not believe that merely looking at ‘Alî’s face as an act of worship. The love that wipes away all sins is a Christian notion of forgiveness. They say their love for Christ will ensure the forgiveness of all their sins on the Day of Judgment, even without good deeds.

The Sunnis reject the quasi-divinity that the Shias have bestowed on ‘Alî. In *Tafsîr Al-Burhân*, we read that Allah said, “‘Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is My proof before all creation and My light . . . [he is] the custodian of My knowledge.” In the same book, we read that Allah has created the heavens and the earth from the light of the Prophet, while the ‘*Arsh* (the Throne) and the *Kursî*²⁵ are

24 Qur’ân 67:2.

25 Chair or footstool; it is not to be confused with the *Al-‘Arsh* (the Throne), which is infinitely higher and greater than *Al-Kursî*. See the Qur’ân: 2:255. (*trans.*)

created from the light of `Alī Ibn Abû Tâlib.²⁶ Similarly, it is common for Shias to slap their knees after finishing prayer and say, “*Tâh Al-Amîn* (the Trustworthy (Angel) has gone astray).” This is to reproach the Angel Jibril who brought the Revelation to Muhammad when he was supposed to take it to `Alī Ibn Abû Tâlib, at least according to the Shias. That they do this is a matter of common knowledge, and had we not seen it ourselves, we would not have mentioned it.

The Sunnis also reject what some of the Shia scholars, such as Al-Kishshî, attribute to `Alī. They write that `Alī said, “I am the countenance of Allah, I am at the right hand of Allah, I am the first and the last, I am the ascendant and the intimate,²⁷ I shall inherit the earth, I am the way of Allah.”²⁸ The Shia scholars have exaggerated the status of `Alī even to the point Al-Mufid said that Allah used to talk confidentially to `Alī.²⁹

As such, we should learn a lesson when considering how the Christians started by only stretching the truth a little, but with time they continued to do this inflating their stories until they ended as worshippers of Jesus instead of being worshippers of Allah. Such fanaticism has even led some groups of Shias, such as the Nusayriyyah and the Druze, to worship `Alī, who they say is the Lord of the heavens and the earth. While the Twelve-Imam Shias

26 Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burhân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur'ân*, 4:226.

27 When these attributes are mentioned in such absolute way, especially in upper case, they refer to Allah, Exalted be He. (*trans.*)

28 Al-Kashshî, *Ar-Rijâl*, 184.

29 Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Ibn An-Nu`mân Al-Mufid, *Al-Ikhtisâs* (*Specialization*); Khomeini praises this man and says that he was a *faqîh* [A knowledgeable scholar of Islamic jurisprudence who deduces the legal rulings from the sources of Islamic Law] and a *mujtahid* [A jurist qualified to attempt a reasoned or deduced solution for unprecedented legal problems] (see Ayatollah Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, 58).

theoretically say that these groups are disbelievers, in fact, they are in accordance with them from a practical point of view.

The Christians show excessive love for Jesus, but they go no further than this and do not follow what he taught. The important thing to their minds is to glorify him; they do not consider that anything they could do in this respect could be wrong. In this way, they have combined their love for him with their own desires. The point of religion is not to instill in a person an overwhelming love that clouds his mind and judgment. His love will not intervene on his behalf before his Lord. We see the love for Allah in obedience to Him, in following His Commandments. This is the evidence of true love, and its final witness. Such a love must be reciprocal, it cannot be one-sided. To demonstrate, while the Christians love the Messiah, he does not love them, because they have abandoned both reason and legitimacy through their exaggeration of his status. Likewise, the Jews love Moses, but he does not love them, for they have defied the Law that he brought them.

What the Prophet's Household said about Shia Extremism

Members of the Prophet's Household spoke of people who would make exaggerated claims about them. `Alī Ibnul-Husayn Zayn Al-`Ābidīn, the Fourth Imam, said "The Jews loved Ezra so much that they finally said [that he was the son of Allah]. But Ezra is not one of them and they have nothing to do with Ezra. The Christians loved Jesus so much that they finally said [that he is the son of Allah]. But Jesus is not one of them and they have nothing to do with Jesus. There will appear among our supporters people who will love us so much that they will finally say about us what the Jews

said about Ezra, and what the Christians say about Jesus. We have nothing to do with them, and they have nothing to do with us.”³⁰

‘Alî is also reported to have said, “Two groups will find destruction because of me: One will exaggerate their love for me to the point that it leads them away from truth, and the other will exaggerate their hatred for me to such a degree that it leads them away from truth. The best of my supporters are those who are moderate.”³¹

Al-Kashshî, a Shia authority on Hadîth, reports that Ja‘far As-Sâdiq said, {“*We certainly are not free of those who will attribute false reports about us. . . . We have no greater enemy than those who take advantage of our name.*”}³²

Only Hypocrites Dislike the Prophet’s Household

The Sunnis obey the Prophet, who said, “I adjure you in the Name of Allah to look after my household.” They believe that to speak ill of them is evidence of hypocrisy. They also consider that ‘Â’ishah is a member of his household,³³ and whatever hurts her hurts

30 Al-Kashshî, *Ar-Rijâl*, p.111.

31 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2:8.

32 Al-Kashshî, *Ar-Rijâl*, 257 and 259.

33 *Ahlul-Bayt*; There is much evidence to support this position in the Qur’ân. For example, the wife of Al-‘Azîz says to her husband what came in the verse which reads, {“*What is the recompense of one who intended evil for your wife but that he be imprisoned or a painful punishment?*”} (Qur’ân 12:25) Similarly, when the Angels spoke to the wife of Ibrâhîm they said, {“*...May the mercy of Allah and His blessings be upon you, people of the house...*”} (Qur’ân 11:73)

the Prophet. To defame `Âishah is to defame the Prophet since Allah has said, {“*Evil words are for evil men (or evil women for evil men), and evil men are [subjected] to evil words (or evil men for evil women). And good words are for good men (or good women for good men), and good men are [an object] of good words (or good men for good women).*”}³⁴ Is it possible that the Prophet would take evil woman into his house and that Allah would leave him in this situation? The books of the Shias are not free of accusations against `Âishah and Hafsah. For example, they say that the Prophet once pointed to `Âishah's house and said, “Disbelief springs from this place.”³⁵ They also say that `Âishah and Hafsah plotted to poison the Prophet.³⁶ How is this possible for them to honor the Prophet and his household while curse his wives, whom Allah has called “Mothers of the Believers?” Allah says, {“*The Prophet is more worthy*

Allah also says, addressing the wives of the Prophet, {“*Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification.*”} (33:33) While some people have said that this cannot refer to the wives of the Prophet since the grammatical form used in this verse is masculine (*`ankum*) and assert that if it had been meant to refer to the wives of the Prophet, it would have been feminine (*`ankunna*), it does, in fact refer to them. This is clear when we consider that masculine verb forms do refer to feminine subjects in other verses of the Qur'ân. In the verse 28:29, Moses says, to his “*abl* (i.e., family)”, “Stay here” (i.e., *imkuthû* - second person masculine plural). According to Shia sources, this refers to Moses' wife, even though the verb is masculine. See also Al-Fadl Ibnul-Hasan At-Tubrasî, *Majma` Al-Bayân li `Ulâm Al-Qur'ân*, 4:211, 4:250; Al-Qummi's *Tafsîr*, 2:139; Al-Kâshânî, *Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 7:95. Allah tells Lût (Lot), {“*Indeed, we will save you and your family [abl], except your wife*”} (Qur'ân 29:33). This is evidence that the word *ahl* includes wife, for if Lût's wife had believed, she would have been saved together with the rest of Lût's family (*abl*), while if she had not disbelieved, she would not have been expressly excluded from them.

34 Qur'ân 24:26.

35 Al-Husayn Al-`Âmilî, *Wusûl Al-Akiyâr ilâ Usûl Al-Akbbâr*, p.79.

36 Al-Majlisî, *Hayâtul-Qulûb*, 2:700.

of the believers than themselves, and his wives are [in the position of] their mothers...}³⁷ How can anyone who claims to be a believer reject that `Âishah is his mother in faith, when this is clearly stated in the Qur'ân? What are we to think when they quote the Qur'ân saying, {*"Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot..."*}³⁸ and use this to prove that `Âishah and Hafsah had apostatized? Is this not much like the hypocrisy of `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' who accused the wives of the Prophet of perversion and corruption? The Shias' doctrines about the Prophet's family are difficult to comprehend, for while they exaggerate the status of some of its members to the point of declaring their divinity, they degrade others and curse them. They even deny that some of them are members of the Prophet's Household at all.



37 Qur'ân 33:6.

38 Qur'ân 66:10.

5

THE COMPANIONS OF THE PROPHET

The hearts of the Sunnis are not burdened in any way for the Companions of the Prophet. They believe that the dignity of the Prophet's Companions places them above all other people in honor. They follow the Prophet's advice for he said, "Do not speak ill of my Companions."¹ Allah says in the Qur'ân, *{“Allah has already forgiven the Prophet and the Muhâjirûn² and the Ansâr³...”}*⁴

Following this, no one ever spoke ill of them again. Insults and curses are not characteristic of pious believers. This cannot be said except by the hypocrites who, in the time of the Prophet, used to slander and ridicule the believers, who gave themselves freely to acts of charity. Allah says about such hypocrites, *{“Those who criticize the contributors among the believers concerning [their] charities and [criticize] the ones who find nothing [to spend] except*

1 Al-Bukhârî and Muslim.

2 The Emigrants from Mecca to Medina.

3 The Supporters of the Prophet in Medina; the inhabitants of Medina who had accepted Islam and supported the Prophet and all the Muhâjirûn upon their arrival there.

4 Qur'ân 9: 117.

*their effort, so they ridicule them - Allah will ridicule them, and they will have a painful punishment.”}*⁵

The Shias' Position on the Prophet's Companions

The Shias insist on their opposition to the Prophet's Companions to the point of saying that all but three of them abandoned Islam after the death of the Prophet. The three they redeem are **Abû Dharr**, **Salmân Al-Fârisî**, and **Al-Miqdâd**. According to them, whoever doubts that the Prophet's Companions abandoned Islam is a disbeliever.⁶ The book *Al-Kâfi* tells us that “Abû Bakr and `Umar both died without having repented, or regretting for wronging `Alî. Because of this, according to Al-Kulaynî, Allah curses them, and so do the Angels and all mankind.”⁷ Al-Kulaynî explains that the verse, {“*Indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed, then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief - never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a way.*”}⁸ was revealed about ‘these two fellows’⁹, who believed in the Messenger, but then disbelieved when they did not swear their allegiance to `Alî. Their disbelief increased when they accepted that others swear allegiance

5 Qur’ân 9: 79.

6 Al-Kulaynî, *Usul Al-Kâfi*, 2:245; Al-Majlisî, *Hayâtul-Qulûb*, 2:640; also Al-`Ayashî's *Tafsîr*, 1:199; Muhammad Murtadâ Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr As-Sâfi*, 1:389; Al-Sayyid Hâshim Al-Bahrânî, *Al-Burbân fî Tafsîr Al-Qur’ân*, 1:319; *Tafsîr Nûr Ath-Thaqalayn*, 1:396; Ja`far Ibn Muhammad Ibn Quluya, *Al-Iktisâs*, 4,5; *As-Sarâ’ir (Secrets)*, 468. *Tujjâr Al-Aswâr (Merchants of Walls)* 22:345, 352, 44

7 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfi*, 8:246.

8 Qur’ân 4:136.

9 That is to say, Abû Bakr and `Umar according to As-Sâfi in his comment on *Al-Kâfi*.

to them rather than to `Alī. Such people cannot claim even the smallest amount of faith.”¹⁰

The Shia scholars claim that `Umar was the illegitimate son of a woman named Sihāk and `Abdul-Muttalib.¹¹ As for Abū Bakr, they say he was Satan's companion and that he and his friend `Umar were both hypocrites, unjust and liars; whoever accepted that they were the legitimate successors of the Prophet will be straying and will die as those who died in the Pre-Islamic Period of Ignorance.¹² `Uthmān, the Shias say, was a straying and an accursed person.¹³

To the Shias, these three are the most despised of the Prophet's Companions and they spare no effort to insult them. Al-Majlisī devoted an entire chapter in his book entitled “the Apostasy of the Three, their Alleged Hypocrisy, and the Disgracefulness of their Behavior.”¹⁴ He also said that whoever believed that `Uthmān was unjustly killed has committed a greater sin than those who worshipped the calf.¹⁵ It is a natural tendency of those who believe whatever they please to exaggerate the things they like and the things they dislike. The strange thing is that while the Shias falsely accuse Mu`āwiyah of ordering the cursing of `Alī by preachers on pulpits,

10 Al-Kulaynī, *Usūl Al-Kāfi*, 240.

11 Ibn Tāwūs, *At-Tarā'if fī Ma`rifāt At-Tawā'if*, 401; Ni`matul-Lāh Ibn Muhammad Al- Jazā'irī, *Al-Anwār Al-Nu`māniyyah fī Bayān Ma`rifat An-Nash'ab Al-Insāniyyah*, 1:61; Muhammad Al-Hasan Al-'Alamī, *Dā'irāt Al-Ma`ārif Ash-Shi`iyyah*, 29:23.

12 At-Tāwūsī, `Abdullāh Ibn Mūsā Ibn Ja`far Ibn Tāwūs At-Tāwūsī, *At-Tarā'if fī Ma`rifāt At-Tawā'if*, p.401; Al-Majlisī, *Haqqul-Yaqīn (Absolute Truth)*, p.204.

13 Al-Maqdisī Al-Ardibīlī, *Hadīqat Ash-Shi`ab (Garden of the Shias)*, p.275.

14 Al-Majlisī, *Bihār Al-Anwār*, 8:208-252.

15 Al-Majlisī, *Haqqul-Yaqīn*, p.270.

and claim that this is an example of his evilness, they themselves curse Abû Bakr and `Umar every day and see nothing wrong in it.

A Continuing Tradition

The Iranian Revolution had raised hopes of change, and some people expected that books published more recently in Iran would not be so offensive as the old books were; the books which the scholars of Shia avoid discussing. But it does not seem like the situation has changed, and the books the Shias are publishing today still follow the well-established tradition of their old scholars. Books such as Muhammad Ar-Radiyy Ar-Radawî's *"They Attributed lies to the Shia"*,¹⁶ Muhammad At-Tijânî As-Samâwî's *"Then I was Guided"*,¹⁷ *"Ask the People of Knowledge"*,¹⁸ and *"With the Truthful"*,¹⁹ and Sheikh Al-Ansârî's book in which he describes the Prophet's Companions as liars and enemies of Allah and His Messenger.

The Shia centers throughout the world have translated the book *"Then I was Guided"* and it is now in print in several languages and widely distributed. Its author describes his conversion from Sufism, which he describes as far from the *Sunnah* of the Prophet. His road ended with Shiism. A quick glance at his book gives us an idea of how Allah **"guided"** him to insult the Companions and the wives of the Prophet. He says for example:

16 Muhammad Ar-Radiyy Ar-Radawî, *Kadhabû `alâ Ash-Shi`ah*.

17 Muhammad At-Tijânî As-Samâwî, *Thumma Ihtadayt*.

18 Muhammad At-Tijânî As-Samâwî, *Fas'alû Ahladh-Dhikr*.

19 Muhammad At-Tijânî As-Samâwî, *Ma`â As-Sâdiqîn*.

“The Companions angered the Prophet, with their bad manners and forward behavior toward him and because they did not show him proper respect... They were stubborn, and argued with him...and challenged the commands of their Lord. They placed themselves above the Prophet.”²⁰

They [the Companions] do not deserve any respect... They took advantage of weak-minded people to spread invented *hadiths* and reports about their own praiseworthiness.”²¹

He continues, saying “‘Umar does not abstain from committing sins nor does he fear Allah,” “The Companions turned back on their heels (i.e. apostatized), so they deserve neither Allah’s reward nor His forgiveness,” “They (i.e. the Companions) were slack in *jihad* and inclined to worldly pleasures,” “They turned back on their heels and innovated freely and shamelessly in religion, saying, ‘We hear and disobey.’”²²

He also claims that the Companions, including ‘Âishah, had changed the *Sunnah* of the Prophet and that they admitted doing so.

At-Tijânî’s other books, *With the Truthful and Ask the People of Knowledge*, are written in the same vein. This is because the essence of Shiism is based on insulting the Companions of the Prophet. Without this, their doctrines are without value or purpose.

20 Muhammad At-Tijânî As-Samâwî, *Thumma Ihtadayt*, pp.88-89.

21 Muhammad At-Tijânî As-Samâwî, *Thumma Ihtadayt*, pp.96, 100, 101.

22 Ibid, pp.104-107.

This insolent has lost his way and mistaken bitterness and hatred for guidance. His scant regard for those who bore Islam on their shoulders, and his insults to the wives of the Prophet bear witness to his lack of understanding. Such bitterness has nothing to do with guidance. He has merely left the falsehood of Sufism and exchanged it for the falsehood of Shiism. Being a Sufi, he was already near to Shiism, since Shiism is the mother of Sufism. Indeed, Sufism itself is a manifestation of Shiism, as Ibn Khaldûn said in *Al-Muqaddimah (The Introduction)*. Both of them are built on false, distorted, and twisted beliefs. These beliefs led them to bury their dead in mosques, to build spectacular tombs and mausolea, and to sanctify their Imams and spiritual leaders. For them, the Imams are infallible and have absolute control over the universe. The Shias and Sufis believe the dead will come to the aid of the living. It would have been more proper for him to refer to the thousands of books of the Sunnis refuting what the Sufis compiled and judging their deviation, but instead Muhammad At-Tijânî kept his nose in the dust and followed his desire.

The Shias and the Sufis both defy Allah's Words, {*"And [He revealed] that the masjids are for Allah, so do not invoke with Allah anyone."*}²³ They are both up to their necks in shrines and tombs and frightful innovations. Allah said, {*"Indeed, those you [polytheists] call upon besides Allah are servants [i.e. creations] like you. So call upon them and let them respond to you, if you should be truthful."*}²⁴ He also said, {*"If you invoke them, they do not hear your supplication; and if they heard, they would not respond to you..."*}²⁵

23 Qur'ân 72:18.

24 Qur'ân 7:193.

25 Qur'ân 35:14.

Muhammad At-Tijânî's book is just another example that stated the impossibility of reconciling the Sunnis and the Shias; as long as the Shias insist on insulting the Companions and Mothers of the Believers (i.e. the wives of the Prophet). Moreover, they slander them and accuse them of perverting religion, distorting the Qur'ân, and conspiring against the Prophet.

The goal of unity is to bind hearts together in mutual affection. But can two hearts, the first of which is filled with love for the Companions, and the second is filled with hatred for them, be reconciled? This book of At-Tijânî is another proof that the Shias today are not different from their predecessors in this respect and that they still insist on insulting the Companions. Shall the sincere Muslims then become conscious of this?²⁶

History is witness to the Companions of the Prophet, who struggled with their property and their lives and their children. They liberated the oppressed countries and spread Islam far and wide. Who else but the Companions of the Prophet have done such things?

Thoughtful and reasonable Shias recognize the mighty achievements of the Companions of the Prophet. For example, Sheikh Muhammad Hasan Âl Kâshif Al- Ghitâ' relates that "When `Alî saw that Abû Bakr and `Umar were making a supreme effort to spread the Word of Allah, he saw that they were preparing armies and sending them out in the service of Allah. They were

26 Not even Khomeini was capable of softening his position toward the Companions. He falsely describes the Companion Samurah Ibn Jundub as a liar who reports narrations that degrades `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib. (see *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.131).

not arrogant and not despotic. So, `Alî swore allegiance to them,²⁷ and submitted himself to their authority.”²⁸

Differences among the Companions

Allah spared our hands from the conflict that arose between the Companions, so why should we not spare our tongues from it? Allah will not ask us about what happened between them. Thus, we read in the Qur`ân:

{“That was a nation which has passed on. It will have [the consequence of] what it earned, and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do.”}

The root of the conflict between the Shias and the Sunnis lies in the Shias’ abuse of the Companions. This led them to insult the wives of the Prophet, to claim that the Qur`ân was distorted, and to claim the notion of Returning²⁹. Once they arrived at this point, they could refuse to accept any *hadîth* reported on the authority of a Companion [claiming that they had apostatized after the Prophet]. When they said the legitimate succession of `Alî and his descendants to the caliphate is supported by the Qur`ân, they were asked to produce this evidence. They could not do this, so they accused the Companions of removing these verses from the Qur`ân.

27 Arabic: bâya` [trans].

28 Muhammad Hasan Âl Kâshif, *Asl Ash-Shi`ah wa Usûlubâ* (The Origin of the Shias and their Sources), p.91.

29 Some of the Shia claim that Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Al-`Askarî, the Twelfth Imam, is hiding in a cave in Samara and will return by the end of this world while others claim that `Alî himself will return.

So long as this obstacle to unity remains, no reconciliation will ever be possible between these two groups. Any attempt to bring them closer must fail; it does not matter how many conferences are held, or how many fine words are spoken. The Shias' hatred for the Companions of the Prophet, and their insistence on insulting them, proves the falsehood of their doctrines.

Who Started Insulting the Companions?

According to An-Nûbakhtî, one of the most respected of the Shia scholars, the first person to insult the Companions was a former Jew called 'Abdullâh Ibn Saba'. An-Nûbakhtî said that 'Abdullâh Ibn Saba' started abusing the Prophet's Companions, especially Abû Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân. Covering himself with a pretense of Islam, he started conspiring against them. An-Nûbakhtî adds, "'Abdullâh Ibn Saba' was one of those who openly insulted Abû Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân and other Companions. He disassociated himself from them and claimed that 'Alî had ordered him to do so. When 'Alî heard this, he sent for Ibn Saba', who admitted saying this. Thereon, 'Alî ordered him to be killed, but people objected to this and said, 'Would you kill a man because he calls people to love you?'"

According to An-Nûbakhtî, "Ibn Saba', while still a Jew, used to say that Yûsha' Ibn Nûn (Joshua) was the rightful successor of Mûsâ (Moses). When he converted to Islam, he started saying that 'Alî was the rightful successor of Prophet Muhammad and he also was the first to say that it was a religious obligation to support the Imamate of 'Alî. It was because of Ibn Saba' that the opposers of the Shia say that Shiism comes from the Judaism."³⁰

30 An-Nûbakhtî, *Firaq Ash-Shi'ah*, (An-Najaf, Iraq), pp.44-45.

There is another account to explain why the Shias are called *Râfidah* (Rejectionists). Mirzâ Taqî relates, Zayd Ibn `Alî, a member of the Prophet's Household, disapproved of the Shias' insulting Abû Bakr and `Umar. They asked him, "What is your opinion of them?" "I only think well of them," He said, "Then you are not one of us," they told Zayd, and rejected him. "Today they rejected us," Zayd said, and ever since, they have been called "*râfidah*" [those who reject].

Since then, Imam Zayd called all Shia fanatics who insulted the Companions *râfidah*.³¹

Once `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' came to `Alî instigating him against Abû Bakr and `Umar, but `Alî scolded him, saying, "Have you dedicated yourself to such things?"

Do the Shias then follow the example of `Alî who wanted to kill `Abdullâh Ibn Saba' for insulting the Companions? On whose side are the Shias today? On the side of `Alî, who was willing to kill a man for hating Abû Bakr, `Umar and `Uthmân, or are they on the side of Ibn Saba' who set the example for those who insult the Companions of the Prophet, his relatives by marriage, and his wives?



31 Mirza Taqî, *Nâsikh At-Twârikh*, 3:590.

6

THE IMAMATE ACCORDING TO THE SHIAS

Sheikh Muhammad Hasan Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' explains that "the Imamate is a divine office like that of the Prophethood. Just as Allah chooses whomever He pleases for the Prophethood, He chooses whomever He pleases for the Imamate, and He commands His Prophet to designate his successor."¹ The Shias believe that Allah appointed 'Alî and his sons to the Imamate² and say Abû Bakr seized the caliphate after the death of the Prophet. Abû Bakr was succeeded by 'Umar and then by 'Uthmân. The Shias say these three men denied the rights of 'Alî and his descendants, and usurped the caliphate due to him. According to some of them, whoever believes that these three legitimately ruled the Muslims is defiantly disobedient or disbeliever according to others. For example, Al-Majlisî says that "The Twelve-Imam Shias agree that whoever denies the Imamate of any of the [Twelve] Imams and rejects showing obedience to what Allah obligated (concerning their Imamate), is a disbeliever who will abide eternally in the Hellfire. "Al-Kulaynî believes disobedience to 'Alî is (an act of)

1 Âl Kâshif, *Asl Ash-Shî'ah wa Usûlubâ*, p. 58; Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.39.

2 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*,1:287.

disbelief and that to accept the leadership of someone other than `Alî is (an act of) polytheism.³

Qur'anic Support for the Imamate was "Distorted"

Some Shias claim that there was evidence for the Imamate of `Alî in the Qur'ân. They hold the belief that the Companions removed this from the text because it mentioned `Alî by name, and designated him successor to the Prophet. One of such verses is 5:67:

"O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord [in the matter of `Alî], and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His Message."

The Shias say that when this verse was revealed, the Messenger of Allah said to `Alî, "Had I not conveyed what I had been ordered to convey about your succession (Imamate), my deeds would have been in vain."⁴

It appears that Khomeini also believed these words were removed from the Qur'ân, since he said, "We believe that the Prophet appointed his successor, and he already did. Had he not done so, he would not have conveyed His Message."⁵ He also believed that Allah had prescribed in the Qur'ân to obey the Imams.

3 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:45, 52; see also Al-Majlisî, *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 23:390.

4 Al-Huaizi, *Tafsîr Nûr Ath-Thaqalayn*, 1:653.

5 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, pp.19, 23.

He quotes the Qur'ân, {“O you who have believed, obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you...”}⁶ Yet, how can we obey someone who is hiding in a cave in Samara? Could a reasonable person buy some fish which is still in water?

Reviewing the Claim of Designating the Imams

The belief that the designation of `Alî⁷ and his descendants as successors to the Prophet is mentioned in the Qur'ân raises other difficulties:

- ❑ Allah commanded the Muslims to consult one another as He said describing the believers, {“...and established prayer and whose affair is [determined by] consultation among themselves...”}⁸ The Caliphate is, undoubtedly, an affair of the Muslims, and neither the Qur'ân nor the *Sunnah* provides any text to say who was to succeed the Prophet. Ash-Sharîf Al-Murtadâ confirms this in the book *Nahjul-Balâghah*. He writes that `Alî said to Mu`âwiyah, “Consultation is the right of the *Muhâjirûn* and the *Ansâr* if they gather and appoint a man to be (Imam), then that is what is pleasing to Allah.”⁹ This indicates that whatever pleases the *Muhâjirûn* and the *Ansâr* will please Allah as well.

6 Ibid. 24.

7 Khomeini says, “Allah had spoken to the Prophet in a revelation and told him who was to succeed him and what he was to do; the Prophet did as he was told and appointed `Alî, Commander of the Faithful Believers, as Caliph. (*Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.43.)

8 Qur'ân, 42:38.

9 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:8.

`Alî then asked Mu`âwiyah to swear allegiance to him and told him, "The people who swore allegiance to Abû Bakr, `Umar, and `Uthmân, are those who swore allegiance to me as well."¹⁰ This proves that `Alî recognized the legality of the Caliphate of Abû Bakr, and of `Umar, since they had been chosen by the majority.

- ❑ `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib swore allegiance to the three Caliphs who preceded him. Everyone agrees about this although the Shias say he initially opposed them. `Alî's oath of allegiance to Abû Bakr, `Umar and `Uthmân is evidence against those who say they support his claim.

As illustrated before, Sheikh Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' said, "When `Alî saw that Abû Bakr and `Umar were making a supreme effort to spread the Word of Allah. He saw that they were preparing armies and sending them out in the service of Allah. They were not arrogant and not despotic. So, `Alî swore allegiance to them, and submitted himself to their authority."

Even the annotator of *Nahjul-Balâghah* said that `Alî acknowledged that Abû Bakr was a better choice for the post of Caliphate, for he said when he made his oath of allegiance to Abû Bakr, "In our view, Abû Bakr is the most deserving person to this office. He was the companion (of the Prophet) in the Cave,¹¹ we know his status, and the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ)

10 Ibid, 3:7; Al-Mufid, *Al-Irshâd*, 31.

11 This refers to his remaining in Mecca with the Prophet after all the Muslims had emigrated, and of his accompanying the Prophet as he emigrated and hiding with him in a cave in the hills above Mecca while Quraysh searched for them far and wide.

appointed him to lead the people in prayer while the Prophet was still alive.”¹²

Al-Majlisî and Al-Kulaynî say that whoever believes that Abû Bakr and `Umar were legitimate successors of the Prophet is a disbeliever. So, what do they say about `Alî, who raised his right hand and swore to obey their leadership? Do they not consider `Alî to be infallible and far above cowardice?

`Alî's Oath to Abû Bakr and `Umar is Irrefutable Proof

The Shia scholars have busily tried to explain their way out of `Alî's oaths to Abû Bakr and `Umar. The most important of their excuses are:

1 `Alî made these oaths out of fear that otherwise, Islam would be lost. The response to this is that Islam at the time of Abû Bakr and `Umar was in its golden age and had spread to Bukhara¹³ in the East along the length of the North African coast to the West.

2 `Alî made these oaths only to show agreement while he hid his displeasure with their leadership in his heart. This claim is even more unpleasant than the first since it depicts `Alî as a two-faced, cowering, muddled man, who says what he does not believe. This cannot convince anyone who knows about

12 `Abdul-Hamîd Ibn Hibatul-Lâh Ibn Muhammad Ibn Abul-Hadîd, *Sharh Nahjul-Balâghah*, 1:132.

13 A city of southern Uzbekistan west of Samarkand. It is one of the oldest cultural and trade centers of Asia and was capital of the former emirate of Bukhara from the 16th to the 19th century. [*trans.*]

'Alî's courage and bravery, and his powerful commitment to truth. Al-Murtadâ narrated many accounts in *Nahjul-Balâghah* confirming this. 'Alî said, "I am from a people who never fear the blame of the blamers as long as Allah's Sake is concerned."¹⁴

If his oath was only as empty words, why was he a minister to the three caliphs during the twenty-five years of their caliphates? It is hard to believe that he maintained this ruse throughout such a long period. Was his giving his daughter in marriage to 'Umar also part of this deception? Was his naming three of his sons Abû Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmân also part of it?

'Alî was one of the most courageous people in history. The Sunnis believe that it is gravely insulting to say that he acted against his conscience out of fear. Can the Shias really love 'Alî and still accuse him of such a thing?

Further, 'Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib rejected the Caliphate when it was offered to him, saying, "Pass me by and choose another, for it is better that I be a minister to you, than a prince over you."¹⁵ Besides, when they made the oath to him after 'Uthmân's murder he said, "By Allah, I had no desire for the Caliphate, and no ambition to power, but you have called me to it and forced it upon me."¹⁶

Judging from these reports, it does not seem that 'Alî considered he had been appointed to the Imamate by the text of the Qur'ân. If this was so, how could he have said, "Pass me by and choose another" and, "By Allah, I had no desire for the Caliphate?" How could he

14 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, p.159.

15 Ibid. 181-182.

16 Ibid. 222.

have sworn allegiance to Abû Bakr and `Umar and `Uthmân? This would have been in defiance of the divine text, had it existed and a manifest contradiction to the *hadîth* of Ghadîr Khumm¹⁷, if authentic.

Everyone acknowledges that Al-Hasan renounced the Imamate in favor of Mu`âwiyah. The Prophet predicted this when he said, 'Verily, this son of mine is a chief [*sayyid*], and Allah will make peace between two great groups of Muslims through him.'¹⁸ The question remains, why did Al-Hasan renounce the Caliphate in favor of Mu`âwiyah? The story is commonly told in the Shia books. These also mention that Sulaymân Ibn Surad' an important supporter of `Alî, used to insult Al-Hasan for this and said to him, "Peace be upon you, 'humiliator of the believers' (*mudhil al-mu'minîn*) instead of 'Commander of the Faithful' (*amîr al-mu'minîn*)."

Criticizing Al-Hasan for his abdication to Mu`âwiyah contradicts the Shia doctrine of the infallibility of the Imams. The Shias consider the words and deeds of their Imams as binding to people to follow. Controversy over the succession seems to have been closed with `Alî's swearing allegiance to the three Caliphs and Al-Hasan's abdication to Mu`âwiyah. The alleged divine appointment of the Imam should have been settled by the willingness of `Alî and Al-Hasan to acknowledge and follow the leadership of another. Why then must the Shias insist upon something that their Imams have renounced?

17 The word *ghadîr* is the Arabic equivalent of "brook"; it is the name of a place between Mecca and Medina where there is a brook. (*trans.*)

18 Al-Bukhârî and others; Nâsrud-Dîn Al-Albânî, *Irvâ' Al-Ghalîl* (*Quenching Thirst*), *hadîth* No. 1597. The Arabic word *sayyid* is used today as an honorific title for the direct descendants of the Prophet. The original meaning of the word is "master" or "lord". [*trans.*]

A Nation that Passed Away

What is the use of talking about the Caliphate and arguing about it? What is the use of returning again to a discussion of an issue that is long dead? Can there be any good reason for us to continue to live in the shadow of these events today, to root around in the past in search of something that could not benefit us now? Is it reasonable for us to spend our time arguing about who was the most worthy of the caliphate, while all of them are long dead? Is it possible for us to turn back the pages of history and give the reins of power to those the Shias wish would have ruled? Is their harping on these things not really a provocation of the devil. Satan only hopes to smash the unity of the Muslims, to rip the Islamic community apart, and to incite even more dissension and discord.

If the Shias truly seek the unity of the Muslims and the revival of its former glory, they should abandon these divisive claims, which are not more than memories. Will they never desist from their annual display of theatrics at 'Āshûrâ' (the tenth of Muharram), which agitates the hearts of the members of our nation and set them one against the other, year after year? They resurrect old hatreds and animosities, and vainly return to settle old accounts!

Truth was with `Alî and his Opponents were Wrong

As for the conflict between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah, the Sunnis agree that `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib was correct to fight for his right. Mu`âwiyah, his supporters, and those who fought beside him, were wrong to challenge `Alî.

We challenge the Shias to come up with a single Sunni book that says `Alî was wrong and the caliphate should rightly have gone

to Mu`âwiyah. We are ready to provide lists of hundreds of books by the Sunni scholars all declaring that Mu`âwiyah was wrong to rebel against the 'Commander of the Faithful', `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib. The Shias are unjustified in calling the Sunnis conspirators (*nawâsib*).¹⁹ The epitaph is based on the belief that the Sunnis supported Mu`âwiyah against `Alî. They also call the Sunnis "Umayyads." These are injustices they will be called to account for on the Day of Judgment.

The First Conflict was Political

The conflict between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah was purely political, yet afterwards it began to take the form of doctrinal deviations. The Shias finally formed an independent sect and split themselves away from the main body of the Muslims. They developed their own approaches to the study of the principles and branches of the *Shari`ah*, *Fiqh*, Creed, and rules of inheritance.

However, was the conflict between `Alî and Mu`âwiyah about these things? Or did both parties share a single belief they both had taken from the Prophet? Mu`âwiyah, in fact, insisted to pursue the murderers of `Uthmân, but `Alî believed that caution and deliberation were necessary to diffuse a potentially explosive situation that took the shape of a dissension. `Alî's opinion was, certainly, the correct approach, and those who differed with him

19 This is what the Shias call the Sunnis, whom they claim conspired against the House of the Prophet. Ni`matul-Lâh Al-Jazâ'irî mentions that the Shias regard the "*nawâsib*" as disbelievers, and impure, according to the consensus of the Twelve-Imam Shia scholars. He goes further saying that [the *nawâsib*] are worse than the Jews and the Christians, and that one of their characteristics is their "preference of other men than `Alî for the Imamate (i.e., the caliphate)"; (see Al-Anwâr An-Nu`mâniyyah, 2:207-207).

were mistaken. In this account, related by the Shia sources, `Alî explains:

“When we first encountered the Syrians²⁰ it was clear that Islam was our common faith. We had not exceeded them at all, neither in faith in Allah nor in belief in His Messenger, and they had not exceeded us either. We only differed about the avenging of the blood of `Uthmân.”²¹



20 Mu`âwiyah's forces; he was at the time governor of Syria [*trans*].

21 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:114.

7

THE MUTUAL LOVE BETWEEN ALÎ AND THE COMPANIONS`

As we saw in the previous chapter, there is no support for the Shia claim that bitterness and hatred arose between `Alî and the Companions of the Prophet. `Alî used to praise them in death, and grieve for their loss saying:

“Where are those who were called to Islam and answered the call, who recited the Qur`ân and lived by the recitation, who drew their swords and went to the far corners of the earth? Where are those whose eyes were reddened from weeping, whose bellies were hollow from fasting, whose voices were hoarse from supplicating their Lord? Where are those who were gaunt from lack of sleep, whose faces were drawn with the fear of Allah? These were my brothers and companions of the road who passed away. Indeed, it is my right to long for them and to bite my lips at their loss.”¹

What best shows the good relationship between `Alî and the Prophet's Companions is the marriage of his daughter, Umm Kulthûm,² to `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb, as confirmed in the Shia books.

1 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, p.235.

2 This marriage gives the lie to the malicious fabrications of those who claim that `Umar Ibnul- Khattâb kicked Fâtimah until she miscarried. Would anyone agree that the man who beat one's pregnant wife, causing her to

Besides, when `Umar asked `Ali's advice on whether he should go himself on the campaign against the Byzantines, `Ali told him, "You are the citadel of the Arabs, their reference, their refuge, and the buttress of the Muslims. If the non-Arabs were to see you tomorrow, they would say, 'This is the source of the Arab's (strength). Should we get rid of him, we would relieve ourselves [from this threat].'"³ Thereon, `Umar did not accompany them on the campaign.

The Shia accounts also report that `Ali said:

*"I saw the Companions of the Prophet. I know of no one else like them. They would greet the morning dust-faced and disheveled, having spent [part of] the night in prostration and standing in prayer, now faces to the earth, now faces uplifted. It was as if they were standing on hot coals when they recalled the approach of the Hour of Reckoning, and they were bleary-eyed from prostrating. When Allah was mentioned, their eyes would be welled up with tears and their cheeks sodden. From fear of Allah's punishment and in the hope of His reward they would rock like a tree in a tempest."*⁴

`Ali used to say about `Uthmân, "[Some] people insulted him⁵, but I was one of the *Muhâjirûn* who sought to please him most."⁶

miscarry should marry his daughter and become his son-in-law? Would one then name one's son after this man? Other Shia sources give the name of the man who did that to Fâtimah as Qunfudh, not `Umar. (see *Bihâr Al-Anwâr*, 43:197-200).

3 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2:18, 20.

4 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, pp.182-189.

5 As done nowadays by some Shias.

6 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 2:3.

The Position of `Alî's Sons regarding the Companions

At-Tubrasî reports that Imam Muhammad Al-Bâqir said, "I do not deny the merits of `Umar, but Abû Bakr was greater."⁷

A woman came to Ja`far As-Sâdiq – the Sixth Imam – and asked him about Abû Bakr and `Umar; whether to give them her loyalty.

"Yes," he said. "And when I meet my Lord, shall I say that you told me to follow them?" she inquired. Again, he said, "Yes."⁸

Besides, once a man was astonished to hear Muhammad Ibn `Alî [a man from the Prophet's Household] call Abû Bakr "As-Siddîq" (the truthful). "Do you call him 'truthful?'" he asked. "Yes, 'truthful'. May Allah not accept the truthfulness of whoever denies it, not in this world nor in the Hereafter,"⁹ said Muhammad Ibn `Alî.

Further, according to an account related by Al-Mas`ûdî, when `Uthmân was murdered, he was sitting reading from the Qur`ân. His wife jumped up and began to scream, "They have killed the Emir of the Believers!" Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn came running but found `Uthmân had already passed away, and they began to weep.¹⁰ `Alî, Talhah, Az-Zubayr, Sa`d, and other Muslims from the *Muhâjirûn* and the *Ansâr* (Supporters) were informed about

7 At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj*, p. 230.

8 Al-Kulaynî Muhammad Ibn Ya`qûb Al-Kulaynî Ar-Râzî (d. 328/939), *Al-Kâfî*, *Ar-Rawdah*, 8:101.

9 Al-Arbilî, Bahâ'ud-Dîn Abul-Hasan `Alî Ibn `Îsâ Al-Arbilî Ibnul-Fakhr (d. 692), *Kashful- Ghummah fî Ma`rifat Al-A`immah*, 2:173.

10 This was reported by "`Alî and Talhah and Az-Zubayr and Sa`d and other Companions of the Prophet."

that, and when `Alî arrived at `Uthmân's house, he was driven to distraction with grief. He said to Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn, "How come that the Emir of the Believers was killed while you were guarding his door?" Then he slapped Al-Hasan on the face, struck Al-Husayn in the chest, and sharply reproached Muhammad Ibn Talhah and `Abdullâh Ibn Az-Zubayr.¹¹

The Bond between the Household of the Prophet and the Companions

`Alî showed great love for the three Rightly-guided Caliphs who preceded him by naming three of his sons after them. The Shia books mention Abû Bakr Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, `Umar Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, and `Uthmân Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib.¹² Further, Alî married his daughter, Umm Kulthûm, to `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb. Besides, Al-Husayn named his sons Abû Bakr and `Umar, and his sons did the same after him. This is an obvious expression of love for and affection for the Companions of the Prophet. This, too, is recorded in the Shia books.¹³ As for Imam Mûsâ Ibn Ja`far, the Seventh Imam, one of his sons was also named Abû Bakr,¹⁴ and he named one of his daughters `Â'ishah,¹⁵ just as his grandfather,

11 Al-Mas`ûdî, Abul-Hasan `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Al-Mas`ûdî (d. 345/956), *Murâj Adh-Dhahab wa Ma`âdin Al-Jawhar*, 2:344.

12 See At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 203, Al-Mufid, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 186, Al-Ya`qûbî, *Târikh*, 2:213, Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p. 142, Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghumma*, 2:64, and Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-'Uyûn*, p.182.

13 See At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 213, Al-Ya`qûbî, *At-Târikh* (History), 2:228, Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, pp.78, 119, Al-Mas`ûdî, *At-Tanbîh wal-Isbrâf*, p.263, and Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-'Uyûn*, p.582.

14 Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghumma*, 2:217, and Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p.561.

15 Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghumma*, 2:90.

`Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib had done before him.¹⁶ Likewise, the Tenth Imam, `Alî Ibn Muhammad Al-Hâdî, named a daughter `Â'ishah and a son Al-Hasan.¹⁷ By the same token, `Abdullâh Ibn Ja'far Ibn Abû Tâlib had a son named Abû Bakr,¹⁸ and Al-Hasan Ibn `Alî named one of his sons `Umar.¹⁹ Ja'far As-Sâdiq, the Sixth Imam, used to say, "Abû Bakr begot twice."²⁰ This is because the name Abû Bakr appeared in the names of both his mother, Fâtimah Bint Qâsim Ibn Abû Bakr, and his maternal grandmother, Asmâ' Bint `Abdur-Rahmân Ibn Abû Bakr.²¹

This confirms that the Shias differ with the Prophet's Household over the Companions. Are there any Shias who are proud to name their children after Abû Bakr or `Â'ishah as the Household of the Prophet themselves have done? Or is this another mistake that the "infallible" Imams are guilty of? Is it an error like the oath of obedience to Abû Bakr and `Umar, or like Al-Hasan's abdication in favor of Mu'âwiyah?

In the light of this, we may put the Shia's "love" for the Prophet's Household to the test. And a question rises: Do the Shias follow

16 Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:334, Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibn `Alî Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah fî Usûl Al-A'imma*, p.283.

17 Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:334 and Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p.283.

18 Abû Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p.123.

19 Al-Ya'qûbî, *Târîkh*, 2:228, Jamâlud-Dîn Ahmad Ibn `Alî Ibn `Inabah (d. 828/ 1424), *Umdat Al-Tâlib fî Nasab Âl Abû Tâlib*, p.81, Al-Qummî, *Muntabâ Al-Âmâl*, 1:240, and Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p.166.

20 Ibn `Inabah, *Umdat Al-Tâlib*, 195, Al-Mufîd, *Al-Irshâd*, p.186, and Al-Kulaynî, *Kitâb Al-Kâfî*, 1:472.

21 Who at the same is the mother of Fâtimah Bint Qâsim.

the example of the Prophet's Household regarding naming their children Abû Bakr, `Umar, `Uthmân, and `Â'ishah? If not, then what can we make of their claim to follow them?

The Unknown Martyrs of Karbala with Al-Husayn

Many Shias may be shocked to hear the news, normally kept from them, that Al-Husayn had a brother and a son, who were both named Abû Bakr, and he had a second brother called `Umar, and that all the three were martyred with him at Karbala. Many important Shia sources mention this.²² According to Al-Majlisî, for example, “`Umar Ibnul-Hasan Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib was martyred at Karbala along with Al-Husayn.” Al-Asfahânî contradicts him, though, maintaining that `Umar Ibnul-Hasan was not killed, but taken prisoner.²³ Thereon, according to the Shia scholars, Al-Husayn's brother, Abû Bakr, and his son, also called Abû Bakr, and Al-Hasan's son, `Umar, were all martyred with Al-Husayn at Karbala. All the three of them bore the names of men the Shias insist wronged the Household of the Prophet and usurped their rights.

It is strange that the names of these men are never heard during the dramatic reenactments of the martyrdom of Al-Husayn staged every year on `Âshûrâ' (the tenth day of Muharram). These three bear the names of two men whom the Shias curse daily. The Shia scholars try to keep these things quiet for fear that the deep bonds and profound love of the Prophet's Household for the Companions

22 See Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, pp. 87, 142, 188, Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, 2:64, Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-'Uyûn*, p. 582, Al-Mas'ûdî, and *At-Tanbîh wa Al-Irshâd*, p.263.

23 Abul-Faraj Al-Asfahânî, *Maqâtil At-Tâlibiyyîn*, p.119.

would be exposed. They especially fear the respect of the Prophet's Household for Abû Bakr and `Umar.

Imâm Mâlik's Response to the Hatred of the Companions

A man once came to Imâm Mâlik and said:

"I hate so and so," and mentioned some of the Companions of the Prophet. Imâm Mâlik quoted, in reply, the following verse:

*{“For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share]. Those are the truthfu...”}*²⁴

Adding, “Are you one of these people [mentioned in the verse]?” “No,” the man replied. Then Imâm Mâlik recited another verse:

*{“And [also for] those who were settled in the Home [i.e. Medina] and [adopted] the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts of what they [i.e. the emigrants] were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation.”}*²⁵

“Are you one of these people?” asked the Imâm.

“No,” the man said. Then Imâm Mâlik read the verse:

{“And [there is a share for] those who came after them, saying, “Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith

24 Qur’ân (59:8).

25 Qur’ân (59:9).

*and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed.”}*²⁶

“Are you one of these?” Imâm Malik asked.

“I hope so,” the man replied.

“You are not, if you curse one of the formers,” Imâm Mâlik said.

A similar debate is attributed to `Alî Ibnul-Husayn Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, related by Al-Arbîlî in his *Kashful-Ghummah*.²⁷

Those who curse Abû Bakr and `Umar forget that they were not only the Prophet's Companions, but his relatives by marriage as well. The Prophet's daughters, Ruqaiyyah and Umm Kulthûm, were married to `Uthmân, and the Prophet's wife, `Â'ishah, was a daughter of Abû Bakr. Another of his wives, Hafsah, was a daughter of `Umar. Can anyone say that the Prophet took bad people for friends, bad people for Companions, and bad people for wives, while he ordered the Muslims not to take bad people for friends, or for companions, or for wives?



26 Qur'ân 59:10.

27 Al-Arbîlî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, p.2:78.

8

WHO KILLED AL-HUSAYN?

There is an important question we should now ask: Who really killed Al-Husayn? Was it Sunnis? Was Mu'âwiyah responsible, or was it his son Yazîd?

The astonishing truth is that many Shia sources confirm that the Shia or supporters of Al-Husayn murdered him. As-Sayyid Muhsin Al-Amîn says, "Twenty thousand people in Iraq swore the oath to Al-Husayn, but betrayed him and rose against him. They turned their backs on their pledge and murdered him."¹

Al-Husayn confronted his murderers at Karbala saying:

"Did you not write to me and say that the time had come, and that you were presenting me with new recruits? A plague on you! Woe to you! You were driven to distraction and called on me for help. You sharpened a sword for us that was already in our hands, and kindled a fire we had already set to consume your enemies and ours. Then, you turned against your friends and joined your enemies. You rushed to swear the oath to me, falling upon me as you fall into your beds. Then you disregarded your oaths foolishly. Away with the tyrants of this nation!"

1 As-Sayyid Muhsin Al-Amîn, *Al-Yân As-Shihâh*, 1:34.

Al-Hurr Ibn Yazid, one of Al-Husayn's companions, asked them, "Did you not call this pious servant of Allah? — Yet, when he came, you did not submit yourselves to him. — Did you not [instead] rise against him and try to make him your prisoner? May Allah not relieve your parched throats on the Day of the Great Thirst (i.e. the Day of Resurrection)."²

Al-Husayn called on Allah saying:

*"O Allah, if you will spare them for a while, then split them asunder and never allow them to rise again. Let the imams (those in authority) never be pleased with them. They called on me and said that they would support me until victory. Then they turned to fight against me."*³

The Shia historian, Al-Ya`qûbî,⁴ mentions that when `Alî Ibnul-Husayn entered Kufa, he saw the women of the town wailing and screaming and commented saying, "These people are crying for us, but who has been fighting us?"⁵ He means that it was they who killed the members of the Prophet's Household.

When Al-Hasan renounced his claim on the caliphate, abdicated to Mu`âwiyah, and reconciled with him, he addressed the people of Kufa, who had fought Al-Husayn and betrayed him, saying:

"O People of Kufa! You have confounded my heart thrice. You murdered my father, deprived me of my wealth, and assaulted

2 At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj*, p.145.

3 Al-Mufid, *Al-Irshâd*, p.234 and At-Tubrasî, *I`lâm Al-Warâ*, p.242.

4 A`Alî Ibn Abû Ya`qûb Ibn Ja`far Ibn Wahb Ibn Wâdih Al-Kâtib Al-`Abbâsî Al-Ya`qûbî (d.284/897).

5 Al-Ya`qûbî, *At-Târikh*, 1:235.

my person. I have sworn allegiance to Mu`âwiyah, so follow him and obey."

Hearing this, a man from the tribe of Banû Asad stabbed him so hard on the thigh that it split open revealing the bone.⁶

This is what the Shia scholars have written, page by page. Clearly, those who claim to support Al-Husayn are the same people who murdered him. They continue to shed tears for him, and make a show of their grief. Even today, they march in his funeral procession. If their grief truly reflects their great love for the Household of the Prophet, why do they not grieve for the Prophet's uncle Hamzah? He was killed in horrible circumstances, which were no easier than those of Al-Husayn at Karbala; Hamzah's belly was cut open and his liver ripped out. So why do they not stage an annual commemoration of his death, slapping themselves in the face, ripping their clothes and striking themselves with swords and daggers? Is Hamzah not a member of the Household of the Prophet? Why do they not grieve so for the death of the Prophet? Surely, our loss of the Prophet was greater than any other.

‘Āshûrâ’ is an Occasion for Joy, not Grief

‘Āshûrâ’ is a time of rejoicing and giving thanks to Allah. The first time the Prophet entered Medina, he found the Jews there fasting. When he asked them why they were fasting, they replied, “This is a great day on which Allah saved Mûsâ and drowned Pharaoh.” The Prophet said to them, “I have a greater right on Moses than

6 Al-Arbilî, *Kashful-Ghummah*, p.540, Al-Mufid, *Al-Irshâd*, p.190, Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Muhimmah*, p.190, and Al-Mas`ûdî, *Murâj Al-Dhabab*, 2:431.

you.” He fasted that day, and ordered the Muslims to do likewise.⁷ How did the Prophet’s act of *Sunnah* change from fasting out of rejoicing to beating oneself and wailing in grief?

The Position of `Alî and his Sons with respect to their “Shia”

Many Shia books, such as *Nahjul-Balâghah*, speak of the anger of `Alî and his sons at their “Shia.” For example, when `Alî was preparing to go out to fight Mu`âwiyah, he addressed them saying:

“Did I not tell you to fight these people day and night, openly and secretly? Did I not tell you to strike them before they strike you? You dream of victory but will not work for it. You became lazy and enjoyed yourselves until you were attacked. When I called for jihad, you did not fight. I called on you openly and in secret but you did not respond. I fix you in the morning, but you return at noon as mean as the serpent. Would that I had never seen you and never known you. May Allah strike you down. You have filled my heart with rage and lain a heavy weight upon my breast. You have ruined my reputation with your disobedience and desertion, to the point that Quraysh said that `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is a courageous man but he does not know anything about war.⁸ ...Would that Allah separate me from you and grant me more worthy companions than you. O Allah, I have grown weary of them and they of me. I have vexed them and they me. Grant me better company than them, and grant them [a leader] less than me.”⁹

7 Related by Al-Bukhârî and Muslim.

8 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, pp.68, 70.

9 Ibid. p.65.

“Oh you, whose bodies are present, but whose minds are absent, you who have so many desires and whose leaders are so unlucky to have you, your leader obeys Allah and you disobey him, while the lord of Syria disobeys Allah and his men obey him. By Allah, I wish that Mu`âwiyah would trade with me so that I would trade ten of you for one of his men.”

“I give praise to Allah for what He has ordained and for trying me with you. You, the party who when ordered [to do something] does not obey and when called does not respond. By Allah, when it is time to pass away, Allah shall certainly separate me from you as I am averse to your company. Is it not strange that when Mu`âwiyah calls upon scoundrels and louts, they swear allegiance to him without asking him for anything in exchange? When I ask you for help, you break away from me and contradict me!”¹⁰

“O People of Kufa! I have been afflicted with three things, and two: The deaf who are hearing, the mute who are speaking, and the blind who are sighted. No free man keeps his word, and no brother is steadfast in adversity. You are like camels without a herdsman. Whenever you are gathered from one direction, you wander off in another.”¹¹

“By Allah, I knew that Mu`âwiyah's people would totally defeat you. Their unity in falsehood is stronger than your difference over the truth. Yours is the rightful Imam but you defy him. They follow a usurper but they obey him. They are honest with their leader while you betray yours. They conduct themselves properly in their country and you ruin yourselves in yours. By

10 Ibid. part II, p.100.

11 Ibid. pp.188-189.

Allah, I have come to doubt everything you say, and I am in no need of your support. I cannot confront any foe with the likes of you. What is the matter with you? What is to be done with you? I seek help with you to overcome distress but in fact you are my affliction.”

“Enough! I am weary of rebuking you. Are you satisfied with the life of this world rather than the Hereafter? When I called you to fight your enemies, eyes revolve as if you would die of hardship. You do not understand a thing. By Allah, I am sure that were you to hear the sounds of battle and catch the smell of death, you would loose your heads and flee from `Alī Ibn Abū Tālib.”¹²

“When I call you to go out in the days of summer, you say, ‘Leave us until the heat breaks.’ And when I call upon you in the days of winter, you say, ‘Leave us until the cold weather passes.’ All of this is only fleeing from hot and cold.”¹³

“I am plagued by men who do not obey when they are commanded, who do not respond when they are called. Why do you turn your backs from every victory from your Lord? Have you no faith to bind you together, no zeal to fire you to battle? I stand in your midst haranguing you, calling for your help, but you do not hear a word nor do you obey an order. I swear by Allah that whoever seeks victory through you is despised.”¹⁴

12 Ibid. pp.65, 75, 38-82.

13 Ibid. p.69.

14 Ibid. pp.90, 118.

The Position of Prophet's Household on the Shias

Al-Hasan Ibn `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib said:

“By Allah, Mu`âwiyah is better for me than those [people of Kufa] who claimed to be my Shias (supporters). They hoped to kill me and then rob me. By Allah, an agreement with Mu`âwiyah through which I spare my blood and secure my own family would be better for me than being killed (at their hands). By Allah, had I fought Mu`âwiyah, they would surely have seized me and handed me over to him. To submit to him willingly and honored is better for me than to [face him] and be killed as a prisoner.”

According to At-Tubrasî, Al-Husayn said that he was “familiar with the people of Kufa and their treachery. Their loyalty is to no one and they are treacherous in word and deed. They are fond of dispute and say their hearts are with us, yet their swords are raised against us.”¹⁵ Besides, `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib is quoted as saying, “Basra is the place where Iblîs (Satan) fell to earth; it is the source of every trial and tribulation.”¹⁶ Further Al-Kulaynî reported that Imam Mûsâ Al-Kâzim said, “If I were to characterize my Shias, I would say I found them to be nothing but heretics.”¹⁷



15 At-Tubrasî, *Al-Ihtijâj*, pp.149-149.

16 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:18.

17 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, *Ar-Rawdah*, 8:228.

9

TEMPORARY MARRIAGE

The Sunnis and the Shias agree that temporary marriage was regarded as an allowable thing in the early days of Islam. This is confirmed by both Imâms Al-Bukhârî and Muslim and other compilers of *Hadîth*. The Sunnis, however, believe that temporary marriage was later forbidden and contradict the Shias for continuing to practice it. They (the Shias) still rely on early *hadîths* and reports that confirm temporary marriage while neglecting later *sahîh* [authentic] ones that forbid it. The *Sharî'ah* clearly tolerated temporary marriage, at one point, but it was later forbidden absolutely and for all time. Wine was also tolerated and deemed allowable in the beginning of Islam, but later prohibited. By the same token, the Companions used to eat the flesh of domestic donkeys before being prohibited. In a nutshell, temporary marriage, wine, and domestic donkey flesh were all forbidden after having been allowable.

Shia scholars recognize that some *hadîths* are abrogated by later ones. Their books also support the repeal of verses in the Qur'ân by *hadîths*.¹ With regard to temporary marriage, Shia scholars view that it was forbidden by `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb,

1 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, p.26.

while `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib confirmed its prohibition during his Caliphate, and the Companions did not object to this.

`Alî would not confirm something that was incorrect, and he would not as well conceal any part of religious knowledge that came to him. Allah took the covenant of people who have knowledge to explain the truth, and not to conceal any part of what they know. Further, the Prophet has said, *"Whoever conceals anything of religious knowledge will be bridled on the Day of Resurrection with a bridle of fire."*²

Besides, the temporary marriage practiced and propagated by the Shias is completely different from the one that was once allowable in the early days of Islam and later forbidden for good. Consider the following points:

- ❑ The Shia have made temporary marriage an essential pillar of religion, and declared that whoever maintains that it is forbidden has denied religion. According to Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî [As-Sadûq] and Al-Kâshânî, Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq said, "Temporary marriage is [a part] of my religion and the religion of my predecessors. Whoever practices it practices our religion. Whoever denies it denies our religion, — believes in something other than our religion."³
- ❑ The Shias hold that temporary marriage is an act of merit that averts Allah's wrath. According to them, the Prophet said,

2 Abû Dâwûd and At-Tirmidhî, and Al-Albânî confirms that it is a *sahîh* (authentic) *hadîth*, see Al-Albânî, *At-Targhîb*, No.116.

3 Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *Man lâ Yahduruhu Al-Faqîh*, 3:366 and Fathul-Allâh Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 2:495.

“Whoever contracts a temporary marriage is safe from the wrath of the Compeller [Allah].”⁴

- ❑ The Shias link temporary marriage with Allah’s forgiveness, and claim that Jibrîl (Gabriel) said to the Prophet during his ascension to heaven, “O Muhammad, Allah said, ‘The women of your nation who have contracted a temporary marriage will earn My forgiveness.’”⁵

According to Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, a man came to Imam Ja’far As-Sâdiq and asked whether the person who contracts a temporary marriage be rewarded? “If he does it for the Sake of Allah Almighty,” the Imam replied, “Allah will record a good deed for him for every word he tells her. He will earn the forgiveness of Allah for sleep- ing with her. [Afterwards,] when he bathes himself, he will be forgiven for every drop of water that touches him.”⁶

- ❑ The Shias made temporary marriage a deed to be rewarded with Paradise. They strongly believe that thanks to it, a person will be ranked with the Prophets in Paradise. They claim that the Prophet said, “Whoever contracts a temporary marriage is safe from the wrath of the Compeller [Allah]. Whoever contracts twice will be among the righteous. And whoever contracts three times will approach my rank in Paradise.”⁷

4 Fathul-Allâh Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 2:493.

5 Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *Man lâ Yahduruhu Al-Faqîh*, 3:463.

6 Ibid. 3:366.

7 Ibid. 3:366.

- ❑ The Shia scholars caution people that failure to contract a temporary marriage will reduce their reward on the Day of Resurrection. They say, "Whoever leaves the world without having contracted a temporary marriage will be brought back on the Day of Resurrection mutilated."⁸
- ❑ There is no limit on the number of temporary wives a man can have at one time. A man could marry as many as he likes in this way, even a thousand or more.⁹
- ❑ The Shia scholars permit temporary marriage to a virgin, without the permission of her guardian, and without witnesses.¹⁰ This contradicts the Prophet's manifest instructions, "*No marriage [is valid] except with [the consent of] a guardian and [in the presence of] two witnesses.*"¹¹
- ❑ The Shia scholars also permit temporary marriage with underage girls. According to *Al-Kâfi*, Ja`far As-Sâdiq was asked about whether a young girl could be taken as a temporary wife. He said, "Yes, so long as she is not (so young) as to be mislead." When someone asked him what this meant, he said, "Ten years".¹²

8 Fathul-Allâh Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr Manhaj As-Sâdiqîn*, 2:495.

9 Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibnut-Tûsî Sheikh of *At-Tâ'îfah*, *Al-Istibsâr fî mâ Ikhtulifa fîhi min Al-Al-Akbbâr*, 3:143 and Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibnut-Tûsî, Sheikh of *At-Tâ'îfah*, *Tabdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:259.

10 Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Ibnut-Tûsî, Sheikh *At-Tâ'îfah*, *Tabdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:254 and Najmud-Dîn Al-Hillî, *Sharâ'i` Al-Ahkâm*, 7:186.

11 Related by Imâm Ahmad on the authority of `Â'ishah, and is regarded as a *sahîb* (authentic) hadîh by Ibn Hibbân, Al-Bayhaqî and Ad-Dâraquţnî. See Al-Albânî, *Irwâ' Al-Ghâlib*, No.1858.

12 *Al-Kâfî fî Al-Furû`*, 5:463, *At-Tûsî*, *Al-Istibsâr*, 3:145, and *Tabdhîb Al-Ahkâm*, 7:255.

- ❑ The Shia scholars also permit anal copulation with wives and claim that Imam `Alī Ar-Ridā maintained that this was permitted by a verse in the Qur`ān, "...since Lût (Lot) said to his people {...*O my people, these are my daughters; they are purer for you...*}"¹³ According to them, Lût said so though he knew that his people did not want to have intercourse through the vagina.
- ❑ According to the Shia scholars, there is no need to ask a woman before entering into a temporary marriage with her whether she is already married or a prostitute, since the only condition for temporary marriage is to pay an agreed upon sum of money (*mahr*)¹⁴ to the woman. According to an account related by Al-Kulaynî, a man once came to Ja`far As-Sâdiq and said, "I travel from time to time and it could happen that I see an attractive woman, but I cannot be sure whether she is married or not." Ja`far told him, "It is not your responsibility to discover this. You only need to pay her the dowry." Who knows, perhaps temporary marriage would help fallen women abandon prostitution, as Khomeini mentions in his book *Tahrîr Al-Wasîlah*.¹⁵
- ❑ The Shia scholars maintain that the minimum time limit for a temporary marriage may be a month, or a day, or may be even an hour or less. The minimum time is simply the time it takes for a man to have intercourse with a woman.¹⁶ They call this "loaning private parts".

13 At-Tûsî, *Al-Istibsrâr*, 3:243 and *Tahdhîb Al-Abkâm*, 7:514.

14 Dowry: A kind of compensation specified in the marriage contract or after concluding it, and is to be paid by the husband. [*trans*].

15 Cf. At-Tûsî, *Tahdhîb Al-Abkâm*, 7:253.

16 *Al-Kâfî fî Al-Furû`*, 5:460 and At-Tûsî, *Al-Istibsrâr*, 3:151.

BUT, if a man contracts a temporary marriage with a prostitute, and pays her the marriage settlement in exchange for sex, is this still prostitution? Besides, if we accept that the minimum period for temporary marriage is one month, as some Shia scholars maintain, then a woman could “marry” twelve men in the course of a year. What kind of honorable and respectable Muslim would allow his daughter, or sister, or mother, to marry twelve men every year? Further, how many could she marry if the minimum period was less than one month? Could a woman spend her time jumping from bed to bed and say this is in the name of the Shari`ah? Where is the decency and modesty Islam has given women? Does this not contradict the hadith in which the Prophet (ﷺ) has said, “*Indeed, I have been sent to perfect noble manners.*”?¹⁷ Those who zealously defend temporary marriage still refuse to allow their sisters, daughters, and mothers, to practice it believing that what is good for others is not good for them.

Debate on Temporary Marriage

This calls to mind an argument between two people, one Sunni and one Shia, about temporary marriage:

“What is your opinion about temporary marriage?” the Sunni asked. “It is allowed, and a good thing,” the Shia replied.

“I am a stranger here,” said the Sunni, “and have no wife in this country, could you lend me your sister or daughter as a temporary wife until I go back to my country?”

The Shia lost his temper and started cursing and insulting him.

17 Al-Bukhari, *Al-Adab Al-Mufrad* No.273 and Al-Albani, *Silsilat Al-Ahādīth As-Sahībah*, No.45.

Temporary marriage is an offense against womens' honor and a despicable thing that turns them into a cheap commodity in the hands of those who hope to change doctrine [from Sunni to Shia]. The Shias use temporary marriage to entice the weak spirited, and entangle them in their sect and present temporary marriage as an advantage of Shiism, something other Muslims do not have. Lust in the name of religion may attract young people who have little control of themselves. Those with base natures will be attracted to the unrestricted indulgence of sexual desire. The notion of temporary marriage denies womens' honor in the name of love for the Household of the Prophet and lowers the lofty and noble status of women guaranteed by Islam.



10

TAQIYYAH (DISSIMULATION)

According to the Sunnis, the original ruling pertaining to lying [regarding one's religious beliefs] is that it is a prohibited, sinful act and a sign of hypocrisy, except in exceptional circumstances where, for example, it is allowable under duress; when a Muslim's life is gravely jeopardized by the disbelievers. For example, when a Muslim is forced by the disbelievers to deny Islam, he is allowed to say that he does not believe in order to save his life. Allah Almighty says, *"Whoever disbelieves in [i.e. denies] Allah after his belief... except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith..."*¹ Even in this case, it is better to persevere silently and refuse to renounce faith even in the face of death. Allah, in His mercy, out of kindness to the believers, allowed the weak to deny outwardly what they believed in their hearts. This is not meant to be used deceitfully or dishonestly, whether against disbelievers or Muslims. Dissimulation is allowed as a dispensation and is not strictness.² Besides, it is subject to two conditions:

- ❑ It should only be used in dire necessity.

1 Qur'ân (16: 106).

2 Dispensation is when what is normally forbidden is made permissible because of necessity or need. While strictness is what Allah initially legislates, of general rulings not concerned with one's circumstances rather than another's, or one individual rather than another. (*trans*).

- ❑ It should only be used against disbelievers, not against Muslims.

However, it is desirable not to resort to dissimulation at all. Believers beware of declaring disbelief, and always try openly to be Muslims, even if this costs them their lives.

The Shia Doctrine of Taqiyyah

The Shias regard dissimulation as permissible, whether out of necessity or convenience. Further, they make no distinction whatsoever between Muslims and non-Muslims when doing this act. They went further making dissimulation a central feature of their doctrine. For them, this is not a dispensation, rather strictness. They do not regard it as something to be used only under compulsion, and do not believe that it should only be resorted to in life threatening situations. For the Shias, dissimulation is a means of protecting their system of belief.³ According to them, any Shia who denies this has denied Shiism and Islam.

Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî said, "Dissimulation is an obligation that cannot be lifted before the return of the Imam."⁴ Whoever abandons it before the Imam's return has abandoned the religion of Allah, Exalted be He, and the religion of the Shias, and has disobeyed Allah, His Messenger, and the Imams."⁵

3 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.61.

4 Imam Al-Mahdî, the Twelfth Imam of the Ja'farî Shias, also known as the "Invisible Imam". See next chapter for a detailed discussion of the role of the Twelfth Imam in Shia doctrine [trans].

5 Ibn Bâbawayh Al-Qummî, *Al-I'tiqâdât Al-Imâmîyyah*, pp.114-115.

According to Shia scholars, Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq said, "Nine tenths of faith is dissimulation. Whoever denies it has no faith."⁶

We even find their Imams deliberately giving incorrect rulings, based on dissimulation. An-Nûbakhtî, for instance, says that `Umar Ibn Rabâh once asked Imam Abû Ja`far [Muhammad Al-Bâqir] a question. Later, he asked him the same question, but he answered differently. When `Umar Ibn Rabâh asked the Imam why he had contradicted himself, he replied, "The first response was based on dissimulation."⁷

The Shias regard dissimulation as an act of worship, an integral part of their doctrine, and a means of drawing near to Allah. This is something that no other religion can claim; not the Christians, nor the Jews, and not even the pagan worshipers of idols, all of whom agree that lying is a wicked, sinful act.

Islam requires its followers to be honest, upright, and steadfast. It forbids cowardliness, treachery, and deceit. Besides, dissimulation has a negative psychological effect since it encourages duplicity, for it depends upon a contradiction between what a person says and what he really does, and separates appearance from reality. None of this is compatible with Muslim behavior, which is characterized by honesty, straightforwardness, and firmness. Muslims must not be deceitful or hypocritical and should fear no one while acting in the service of Allah.

The lives of the Imams, who were persecuted and abused for raising the Word of Truth (i.e. Islam) and for standing up for what

6 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Uṣūl Al-Kāfi*, 2:217, 223.

7 An-Nubakhtî, *Firaq As-Shi`ah*, p.52, Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kāfi*, 1:65 on the authority of Imam Ja`far.

was right, clearly show that they were the furthest of all people from lying and double-dealing. Al-Husayn and his family faced death for the sake of truth, and Imam Mûsâ Ibn Ja`far went to prison many times for insisting on truth and opposing the Caliph Hârûn Ar-Rashîd.⁸

While Shia scholars deny that they use dissimulation freely and insist that it is only to be used in times of persecution, their books contradict them. There is a story in *Al-Kâfî* about a man who asked Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq about the meaning of a dream. It happened that Abû Hanîfah was sitting with Imam Ja`far and Imam Ja`far asked Abû Hanîfah to answer the man's question [interpreting his vision]. When Abû Hanîfah had finished, Imam Ja`far said, "By Allah, Abû Hanifah, that is the answer!"

After Abû Hanîfah left, the man said to Imam Ja`far, "I did not like the answer [interpretation] that lying Sunni gave me." "He was wrong anyway," Imam Ja`far said. "But you swore he had the answer." "Yes. I said he had the answer, the wrong one." Imam Ja`far explained.⁹

This is obviously a casual use of dissimulation. The above-mentioned tale indicates nothing that could have forced Imam Ja`far to resort to dissimulation. We are not told that Abû Hanîfah held him at sword point, or demanded that anyone accept his interpretation of the dream. Once one of the Shia Imams swore oaths that the Shias no longer resort to dissimulation. It was said to him that perhaps his oath had been taken as an act of dissimulation.

8 Abbasid caliph, ruled 170/786 to 193/809. Imam Mûsâ Al-Kâzim died in 799 [*trans*].

9 Al-Kulaynî, *Al-Kâfî*, *Ar-Rawdah*, 8:292.

This points out that the doctrine of dissimulation has raised doubts about everything the Shias say. Naturally, people could not be blamed for doubting them. The blame must lie with those who made dissimulation an article of faith. They are the ones who have destroyed the Shias' credibility while imagining that by concealing the truth would undermine the confidence of others. Let them speak truthfully and give up dissimulation if they want to be trusted.

A simple illustration of dissimulation is the Shias' use of a small tablet made from the clay of Karbala¹⁰ upon which they place their foreheads when prostrating in prayer. They carry these tablets with them, and always use them when they perform prayer in their own mosques. But when they enter a Sunni mosque, they keep these things hidden and follow the Sunni imam (leader in prayer), and then repeat their prayers when they arrive home.¹¹

Zakâtul-Khums: The Charity of the “Fifth”

THIS is a topic of crucial importance in the survival of Shiism, for the Shias have to give one fifth of their profits to their Imams. This adds up to a large sum of money and provides the Shia Imams with considerable wealth. This calls to mind a verse from the Qur'ân criticizing priests and monks from the Children of Israel for leading people astray in their pursuit of worldly gain. Allah says, *“O you who have believed, indeed many of the scholars and the monks devour*

10 This is called a *qurs* [trans].

11 Sheikh Mûsâ Al-Mûsawî mentions this. He was authorized as a *mufîi* and *mujtahid* (two ranks of the Shia priesthood) by Sheikh Muhammad Al-Hasan Âl Kâshif Al-Ghitâ' at An- Najaf.

the wealth of people unjustly and avert [them] from the way of Allah..."¹²

The Shias support that practice with the verse that reads, {"And know that anything you obtain of war booty – then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives..."¹³ They hold that the share of Allah, His Messenger, and near relatives is due to the Imam who stands in the place of the Messenger of Allah.¹⁴ They do not accept that this verse is about war booty. On the other hand, there is no evidence from the biography of the Prophet, or that of `Alī, to support the idea that either of them ever took any portion of people's money for themselves. Nor will we find anything to support this in the chronicles from the time of the Prophet and the Rightly-guided Caliphs. While these chronicles even record the names of tax collectors, they do not mention that any one ordered the collection of any tax called *khums* from the Muslims. Even the Shia sources do not mention this.

Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan At-Tūsī, who founded Al-Hawzah Ad-Dīniyyah (the Religious Institute) at An-Najaf in the beginning of the fifth century A.H., and was one of the greatest Shia scholars, has mentioned nothing about this in any of his well-known books on *Fiqh* (Islamic Jurisprudence), although he has discussed everything else imaginable. This has lead several Shia authorities, including Ahmad Al-Ardabīlī – a *faqīh* who Shia called *Al-Muqaddas* i.e. the holy –, to regard the taking of *khums* as prohibited.

12 Qur'ān 9:34

13 Qur'ān 8:41

14 At-Tubrasī, *Majma` Al-Bayān fī Tafsīr Al-Bayān*, 4:543.

But there is another reason behind deeming this practice prohibited; that is the income it generates is enormous, which, in turn, has spoiled the Imams who exploit the generosity and ignorance of ordinary people in an obsessive pursuit of material pleasure. When we add the income from *khums* the great sums of money that people donate to the shrines of the Imams and the money that rolls into the pockets of the Shia Sheikhs, their wealth must be truly astonishing.

All these things contribute to the temptations and pleasures of the Shia cult and prevent them from taking a correct position toward their own teachings, the things they allow, and the mistaken doctrines that surround them on all sides. All of this has placed the Shia scholars among the wealthiest of all people. They may lead a life of unfettered indulgence of their material desires. Their sexual appetites are indulged by the women who long for the honor of offering themselves as temporary wives to the Imams and descendants of the Prophet. In this way, ordinary people are thus robbed of their property in the name of the love for the Household of the Prophet. That is why some of Shia scholars ascribe themselves to the Prophet's Household exactly as some of the Sufis do, since this claim is an assured way of earning gains. They should rather be far above caring for robbing people's property and above being a source of burden on them.



11

 THE TWELFTH IMAM: AL-MAHDÎ

The Sunnis believe that Allah will send a man, namely Al-Mahdî (Mahdi), from the Prophet's descendants who will come to support Islam. He will fill the earth with justice as it had been filled with oppression and iniquity. He will bear the name of the Prophet and his father.¹ The Sunnis also believe that Al-Mahdî will come in the last days of the world, at the time of Jesus's return. The Prophet mentioned these things in the presence of many of his Companions, many of whom have passed on to us continuously recurrent narrations of what he said and done.²

Unlike the Sunnis, the Shias believe that Al-Mahdî came long ago. According to them, he was Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Al-`Askarî, the Twelfth Imam, who, they say, was born in the second century A.H., son of the Eleventh Imam, Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî. Shias believe that at the age of five, Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan entered a cave and vanished. Though one thousand and two hundred years have passed, they are still waiting for him to reappear. We do not dispute the possibility of a man staying in a

1 That is to say, his name will be Muhammad Ibn `Abdullâh [*trans*].

2 *Mutawâtir* (Continuously Recurrent) *Hadîth* is a *badîth* reported by a large number of narrators whose agreement upon telling a lie is inconceivable (this condition must be met in the entire chain from the beginning to the end). [*trans*].

cave for thousands of years, for the Qur'ân speaks about the great age of Nûh, and about the Sleepers of Ephesus. Yet, it is enough to refute this notion to quote Shia sources which tell us that the story of that boy is baseless. There is another flaw in the tale; that is a boy of five years cannot hold the Imamate since one of the conditions made by the Shias for the Imamate is that its holder must have reached puberty.³ According to Shia scholars, the Imam must be mentally competent, prudent, just, and well versed in the Sharî'ah.

These sources say that Imam Al-Hasan Al-'Askarî, the Eleventh Imam, died childless and had no children by his wife, or by any of his slave girls. When he died in 260 A.H., his relatives waited in vain to hear that any of his wives or slave girls was pregnant. His estate was finally divided between his mother and his brother Ja'far.⁴ When the Sultan sent an emissary to interview his family, they confirmed officially that he died without issue.⁵ Al- Mufid confirms this and says, "He had no children born to him in his lifetime, and none posthumously."⁶

Despite this evidence, modern Shias insist that the Invisible Child⁷ is alive today. He has now lived even longer than Prophet Nûh.

3 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, pp. 45-46.

4 *Al-Kâfi*, *Al-Hujjah*, p.505, *Al-Mufid*, *Al-Irshâd*, p.339, *Al-Arbîlî*, *Kashful-Ghumma*, p.408, Al-Mashgharî, *Al-Fusûl Al-Mubimmah*, p.289, Al-Majlisî, *Jalâ' Al-'Uyûn*, 2:762, and At- Tubrasî, *I'lâm Al-Warâ* p.377.

5 Al-Qummî, *Al-Maqâlât wa Al-Firaq*, p. 102 and At-Tubrasî, *I'lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 377.

6 Al-Mufid, *Al-Irshâd*, p. 345 and At-Tubrasî, *I'lâm Al-Warâ*, p. 380.

7 Who is in fact called by the Shias the Invisible Imam. [trans].

The Last of the Imams

The death of Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî exploded the myth upon which the Shia doctrine is based: that there has been a continuous and unbroken line of Imams since the Eleventh, and Last Imam left no heirs. The death of Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî resulted in more splits and schisms among the Shias who, being left without an Imam designate, began to differ over the leadership. Some of them turned to Al-Hasan's brother, Ja'far Ibn `Alî and thus rejected the Shia doctrine that the Imamate must pass from father to son.⁸

Following the death of Al-Hasan Al-`Askarî, one of his supporters, `Uthmân Ibn Sa'id, began to spread reports of the "Invisible Imam," the hitherto unknown son of Imam Al-Hasan, called Muhammad, who was hidden in a cave. Muhammad Ibnul-Hasan Al-`Askarî, said `Uthmân Ibn Sa'id, was the rightful Imam after his father, and he, `Uthmân, had been appointed as his intermediary to the world, and had been charged with the responsibility of collecting money from the people and bringing it to him in the cave. The Shias are still waiting for him to emerge from his cave, and send a man there to call into the cave saying, "Come out, May Allah hasten your relief!" When this man dies, he is replaced with another. The cave eventually became a great source of income, since the Shias go there and throw money into it hoping to be cured of illness, protected from evil, or granted some benefit in the world.

When asked why the Invisible Imam should have disappeared into the cave, the Shias reply that he feared for his life.⁹ But this contradicts the Shia belief that the Imams die only by choice and that

8 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:285.

9 At-Tûsî, *Al-Ghaybah*, p.199 and Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:338.

they have knowledge of what was and what will be.¹⁰ Still, they insist that "Al-Mahdî" was in mortal danger from the Abbasid Caliphs, the Umayyads, and others. Despite this danger, he had had other opportunities to come out safely. One of such instance was when the Shia Buwayhid dynasty came to power in Iraq,¹¹ and again when Shah Ismâ'îl As-Safawî ruled Iran causing a massacre among Sunni Muslims.¹² A more recent opportunity appeared with the Iranian Revolution. But why has the Invisible Imam still not come out of this cave?

The Task of Al-Mahdî: the Meting out of Revenge

According to the Shia sources, when Al-Mahdî emerges, Allah will bring the Companions of the Prophet, who "usurped" the Imamate from the Prophet's Household, back to life again. Also, all the Imams of the Shias will be brought back at the same time. The first thing Al-Mahdî will do when he emerges is to chop off the heads of those Companions such as Abû Bakr and `Umar. He will behead each of them with a single blow of his sword, beginning with Abû Bakr and moving from him to all of the caliphs. The Household

10 Al-Kulaynî, *Usûl Al-Kâfî*, 1:258.

11 The Buwayhids ruled Persia and Iraq in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. The first Buwayhid ruler of Iraq was Mu'izzud-Dawlah Ahmad, who ruled 334/945 to 356/967. His son `Adud Ad-Dawlah united the families possessions in Iraq, southern Persia, and Oman. The dynasty was supplanted by the Seljuk occupation of Baghdad in 447/1055 and was finally deposed completely seven years later. (Bosworth, *Islamic Dynasties*, p.97) [trans].

12 Ruled 907/1501 to 930/1524. Shah Ismâ'îl introduced the Twelve-Imam Shiism as the official religion of Persia which, up to then, had been predominately Sunni. (Bosworth, *Islamic Dynasties*, p.173) [trans].

of the Prophet will then be avenged. This belief is known among them as the doctrine of the Return.¹³

Those who invented this doctrine did not call it thus because Al-Mahdî would "return" filling the earth with equality, justice, and security, rather because the enemies of the Shias would "return" at the head of whom are the Rightly-guided Caliphs. Otherwise, what purpose would their return and beheading serve, when equality and justice had been achieved by the return of Al-Mahdî?

A better explanation for this doctrine is that it protects the Shia cult from disintegration and extinction. In order to invite people to embrace their cult and prevent them from leaving it, the Shias promise every new generation of Shias that Al-Mahdî will return soon, and insist upon the necessity of waiting for him, since he will avenge them. Such promises help keep the cult from dwindling and fading away.

No One shall Bear Another's Burden

According to *Tafsîr As-Sâfi*, when Al-Mahdî returns, he will kill the descendants of those who killed Al-Husayn in revenge for their ancestors' deed. He will also behead five hundred of the Quraysh, strike off the heads of Mu`âwiyah and Yazîd, and whip `Â'ishah.¹⁴

These ideas clearly contradict the teaching of the Qur`ân, that assures us that no one shall bear the burdens of another. The doctrine itself resembles Christian beliefs about "original sin."

13 Called *Ar-Raj`ah* in Shia books.

14 Muhammad Murtadâ Al-Kâshânî, *Tafsîr As-Sâfi*, 1:172.

According to this Christian teaching, Allah's wrath is upon all the children of Âdam (Adam) because of the error of their father.

The Doctrine of “the Return” Stands in the Way of Reconciliation and Unity

How could the Shia ever hope for unity with the Sunni Muslims while they believe this doctrine of “Return?” This fills their hearts with the hope of revenge against the Companions of the Prophet, whom they say usurped the right of `Alî and wronged the Household of the Prophet with their claims upon the leadership of the community. Such thinking does widen the breach between the Shias and the Sunnis, and puts any hope of reconciliation and mutual understanding completely out of the question. As a result of such way of thinking, the Prophet's Companions are still reviled by the Shias day and night.

How could the Shia call for unity and reconciliation when every year at the festival of `Âshûrâ` they reopen bitter wounds, and point at the Sunnis whom they accuse of killing Al-Husayn? Until the Shias release themselves from the past, hope of unity and reconciliation will only be a pipe dream. Since the cult is based upon these events, it seems highly unlikely that they will ever move toward sincere reconciliation, free from the taint of dissimulation and flattery. The Shias do not conceal their hatred for the Companions of the Prophet, who were the best of this nation. How, then, could we possibly hope that the Shias love us when we are much less than those they hate?



12

**THE DOCTRINE OF MANIFEST
KNOWLEDGE AND OTHER INNOVATIONS**

Nearly all the Shias repeatedly say some words related to the doctrine of "manifest knowledge" on a daily basis, particularly when they visit the shrines of the two Imams `Alî An-Naqiyy Ibn Muhammad, the Tenth Imam, and Al-Hasan Al-`Askari, the Eleventh Imam. At such occasions, they say the Arabic words for "Peace be upon you both, those of whom knowledge was made manifest to Allah."¹ While Shia books describe these ritual visits and instruct people to say this, most Shias do not know what "manifest knowledge" means.²

The doctrine of "manifest knowledge"³ was invented to settle a dispute over the succession to the Imamate. Formerly, the Shia doctrine stated that the Imamate moves from father to eldest son

1 The Arabic words for this are, '*As-Salâmu `alaykumâ yâ man Badâ lil-lâhi fî-Kumâ*' [trans].

2 There are many books devoted to the subject of visits to the graves of the Imams, these are generically known as *Kutub Al-Ziyârât*. The above is quoted from the book *Mafâtih Al-Jinân*, p29.

3 "Manifest knowledge", *Al-Badâ* in Arabic, signifies a kind of divine knowledge that came to Allah only recently and of which He was not previously aware. The notion also appears in Jewish theology, it is a contemptible idea which denies Allah's absolute knowledge of all things.

and no other line of succession is possible. But when Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq's eldest son, Ismâ`îl, died in his father's lifetime, his younger son Mûsâ was designated by his father as the next Imam. In this case, the Imamate (in the form of designation) moved from Ismâ`îl to his brother Mûsâ. The normal procession from father to eldest son was thus broken.

Since the Shias believe that the Imam is divinely ordained, this change in the succession had to be attributed to Allah, but how should this be done? Did Allah not know that the divinely designated future Imam would ever succeed to the Imamate? How could the divine designation fail to be fulfilled? To solve this dilemma, the Shia scholars said that divine knowledge of the Imamate was suddenly made manifest to Allah. Put differently, what Allah did not know was then made apparent to him. Besides, former divine knowledge and present divine knowledge were different! In this way, the change to the succession was finally attributed to Allah, and not to the intervention of Imam Ja`far As-Sâdiq. Undoubtedly, some Shias objected to this solution and a schism developed within the group. This is the origin of the Shia sect called Ismailis, which holds the belief that Ismâ`îl Ibn Ja`far was the last rightful Imam.

It is worth mentioning that Shia scholars try shyly to evade this notion while they never tried to eliminate such statement which ascribe to Allah what He is far above. That is because the doctrine of "manifest knowledge" rests on the claim that Allah, Blessed and Exalted be He, is ignorant, and contradicts His divine qualities of omnipotence and perfect knowledge of all things. They, thus, endorse some of the erring beliefs of the Jews concerning the Attributes of Allah. Is it not a weird paradoxical conclusion that the Shias deny to Allah the attributes they ascribe to their Imams; that is to say absolute knowledge of all future events; knowledge

that precedes even the creation of the universe? According to them, their Imams "know what was and what will be, they know what will not be and if it was how it would be."

Some Other Bid`ahs⁴ of the Shias

Innovation in religion is forbidden, this is because Islam was revealed to the Prophet in a complete form. Religion is what we were taught in the Qur`ân and the *Sunnah*. Nothing has been left out of this and so nothing may be added to it. The Prophet repeatedly warned his Companions against introducing new forms of worship into Islam and told them that it would ultimately lead people to disbelief.

Additions to the Adhân (Prayer Call)

The Sunnis believe that `Alî was very close to Allah and dear to Him, but this cannot justify any change to the prayer call to confirm this fact, as the Shias have done. The Shias say in Arabic *Ashhadu anna `Aliyyan bil-Haqqi Waliyyul-Lâh*, this means, "I bear witness that `Alî is truly the walî of Allah (divinely appointed)." The Shias' prayer call contains three statements of belief:

- ☐ Belief in the Oneness of Allah
- ☐ Belief in the Prophethood and the Revelation
- ☐ Belief in the divine appointment of `Alî (*Al-Wilâyah*).

This addition to the prayer call was not made during `Alî's lifetime, and he would certainly have disapproved of his name being added

4 Matters innovated in religion.

to it. Neither was this done in the lifetimes of his sons, may Allah be pleased with them all. The Shia scholars agree that this was rather introduced in the tenth century A.H., during the rule of the Shah Ismâ'îl.⁵ The new prayer call became the hallmark of the cult and announced their existence in any town where it was heard. It also served to distinguish their mosques from those of the Sunnis. The new prayer call opened the door to other additions.

But, are Al-Hasan and Al-Husayn not also divinely appointed as they claim? What about the Imams Muhammad Al-Bâqir, Ja'far As-Sâdiq, and Mûsâ Al-Kâzim, are they not also divinely appointed? So why do we not say so in the prayer call? Every bid'ah comes with another like it. Accordingly, the Ismaili prayer call has grown extremely long since they mention the names of all the seven of their Imams in it confirming that each was divinely appointed.

This is not the only addition they have made to the prayer call, for they have added the Arabic words, "*Hayy `ala Khayr Al-`Amal*", "Hasten to the best of works." This too was added in later years. `Alî did not know anything about it or hear it, and so did all of his sons and all the members of the Prophet's Household.

We appeal to the Shias to abandon this practice and come back to the prayer call first raised by Bilâl in the Prophet's Mosque, in his presence and in the presence of his Companions, including `Alî.

5 Ismâ'îl Ibn Haydar ruled Persia 907/1501-930/1524. He spoke Turkish but probably of Kurdish origin, he established the Safavid dynasty which ruled Persia for nearly three hundred years. This dynasty was named for Sheikh Sâfiyyud-Dîn (d. 735/1334), who established a Sufi order, *As-Safawîyyah* at Ardabil in Azerbaijan. Shah Ismâ'îl I, along with his successors, claimed not only to be descendants of Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, but also said they were reincarnations of the Shia Imams. (See Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties*, (Edinburgh, 1967) pp.172-173 [trans].)

Prostration on Clay Tablets⁶

The Shias prostrate on clay disks and hallowing stones, that have to be made from the clay of Karbala, the place of Al-Husayn's martyrdom. In this way, they link the one prostrating to Allah with Al-Husayn. Almost all Shia households have a collection of dust and stones from Karbala. They prostrate themselves on them, kiss them, and bless themselves with them. They always have those things with them even in their travel. But, the clay tablet has taken on another dimension too, for it provides a path to disbelief, and leads a man to be linked with something [or someone] other than Allah. The Prophet never performed prayer on such a tablet, nor did 'Alî, nor any of the Prophet's Household, may Allah increase them in honor.

One of the examples illustrating the Shias' glorification of the clay of the tomb of Al-Husayn is what Muhammad Ibrâhîm Al-Qazwîni has said, "He, peace be upon him, has said, 'Prostration on the clay of the tomb of Al-Husayn illuminates the seven earths. The one who has a rosary from the clay of the tomb of Al-Husayn will be written among those who exalt [Allah] with praise, even though he did not praise [Allah].'"⁷

Combining Two Prayers

The Shia normally combine the *Zuhr* Prayer and the 'Asr (Afternoon) Prayer and do likewise with the *Maghrib* (Sunset) Prayer and the 'Îshâ' (Night) Prayer. This contradicts the words

6 These are known in Arabic as *At-Turbab Al-Husayniyyah* [trans].

7 Muhammad Ibrâhîm Al-Qazwîni, *As-Sujûd 'alâ At-Turbab Al-Husayniyyah* (*Prostrating on Al-Husayn's Dust*), p.34.

of Allah who said, {"...Indeed, prayer has been decreed upon the believers a decree of specified times."}⁸ This verse means that each prayer has a particular time. The Prophet has confirmed this although he used to join two prayers when traveling, or if it was raining, or in case of accidental illness.

Besides, combining two prayers runs counter to the Shia sources, which describe how `Alī once advised the rulers of a country "to lead the people in the *Zuhr* Prayer when the sun fills a fold of goats and to lead them in the *ʿAsr* Prayer when the sun is still white hot and one has walked two leagues. And to lead them in the *Maghrib* Prayer when the one fasting breaks his fast and when the pilgrim sets off [from `Arafât], and lead the *ʿĪshâ* Prayer when the twilight fades away and until the end of night."⁹

Suspension of the Friday Prayer

Most Shia scholars maintain that attendance at the *Jumu`ah* (Friday) Prayer in a mosque is no longer obligatory. They leave it up to the people to choose whether to perform the *Jumu`ah* Prayer in a mosque or to pray it as the *Zuhr* Prayer at home.¹⁰ This clearly contradicts the Qur'anic verse in which Allah says, {"O you who have believed, when [the *adhân*] is called for the prayer on the day of *Jumu`ah* [Friday], then proceed to the remembrance of Allah and leave trade..."¹¹ The reason they give for this is that Imam Al-Mahdī has not reappeared, and as long as he is not present, there is no obligation to attend the *Jumu`ah* Prayers.

8 Qur'ân (4: 103).

9 Al-Murtadâ, *Nahjul-Balâghah*, 3:82.

10 Khomeini, *Tabrîr Al-Wasîlah*, 1:231.

11 Qur'ân (62: 9).

This is a practical example of *bid'ahs* introduced by the Shia scholars into religion. While these practices increase the divisions between the Shias and the Sunnis, they are not less serious than some of the other things they do, such as seeking the assistance of others than Allah, raising the hands in supplication to the dead, attributing falsehood to Allah, claiming that the Qur'ân has been distorted, and insulting the Prophet's Companions and his wives, which, indeed, are the divisive things.



13

THE SHIAS IN HISTORY

The history of the Islamic world is full of tragedies inflicted on it by heretical groups. The Muslims suffered under the Fatimid state founded by the Ismaili leader `Ubaydullâh Al-Fâtîmî. Muslims endured campaigns of murder and assassination at the hands of the Al-Qarâmitah (*Shi'ite* Qarmatian sect of Ismailites), the Assassins, Al-`Abidiyyûn (Ibadis), Ismailis, and the Buyids.¹ For example, in

1 Al-Qarâmitah; the Qarmatians: They were members of a social and political reform movement. This movement was co-opted by the Ismailis in the tenth century and was finally absorbed by them before the First Crusade. It was a "Shia" movement, in a general sense, but they tended to regard claims to `Ali's legitimacy as a means to attain power, rather than an end in themselves. Their political method was conspiracy, and they relied on strict secrecy, in which the name of the supreme leader was never pronounced. They instituted a system of gradual initiation and ritual, which may have reached the West and influenced the development of guilds and freemasonry. They had a philosophical doctrine that relied on an allegorical interpretation of the Glorious Qur'ân. They denied all divine attributes of Allah. Their doctrines seemed to owe much to pre-Islamic religious traditions. The Assassins were another Ismaili sect. At the time of the Crusades, they had adopted assassination as their favorite method of dealing with political opponents. The name comes from the Arabic word *hashshâsh* (a user of hashish). They did not differ from other Ismailis in matters of doctrine, but they followed a system of political organization into a secret league whose members owed blind obedience to the spiritual head. This and their use of murder as a political method is what distinguishes them.

The Al-`Abidiyyûn are one of the sects of the Kharijites (the Seceders),

317/930 the Al-Qarâmitah stormed Mecca killing many pilgrims throwing their bodies into the well of Zamzam. Then they removed the Black Stone and usurped it. They were a constant source of trouble until the appearance of Salâhud-Dîn (Saladin), whom they tried to kill many times, but Allah confounded their plots with this man, who brought down the Al-Fâtimiyyûn (Fatimids) state and defeated the Crusaders utterly.

Who was behind the Fall of Baghdad?

The Tatars' sack of Baghdad and its destruction by Hûlâkû (Hulegu) Khan was the worst tragedy the Muslims had ever known; about two million Muslim persons were murdered and their women were taken as booty. This was the fruit of treacherous plots of two Shias, Muhammad Ibnul-`Alqamî and Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî,² employed

now confined to Oman and some oases in southern Algeria. They were the followers of `Abdullâh Ibn `Ibâd Al-Murî At-Tammîmî who left the main branch of the Kharijites about the year 65/684. They differ from the more extreme Kharijites in not considering non-Kharijites as disbelievers and rejecting political murder. They do not believe that the existence of an Imamate is an unconditional necessity. In later years, the Ibâdis split into at least twelve smaller sects and schisms. (*Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, (Brill, 1974), entries for Assassins and Al-`Abîdiyyûn, and Qarmatians). The Buwayhids were a Shia dynasty that ruled Iraq and Persia in the tenth and eleventh century. (Bosworth, *The Islamic Dynasties*, p.97) [trans].

2 In his biographical dictionary, *Al-A`lâm (Prominent Figures)*, Az-Ziriklî said, "He [At-Tûsî] was much respected by Hûlâkû who used to ask for his advice and follow it. At-Tûsî was a philosopher who used to consult astrologers and even set up a trust to provide for their material needs. He murdered the Caliph (Al-Musta`sim), blotted out judges, scholars of *Hadîth*, and *faqîhs*, while causing no harm to philosophers and astrologers. A general perusal of his books will reveal that he was deeply immersed in philosophical matters and much influenced by the ideas of Ibn Sînâ (Avicenna) and Ptolemy. He was also involved in magic and the occult and was a serious student of witchcraft, going so far as being initiated as a sorcerer and further he worshipped idols."

as ministers in the government of the last of the Abbasid caliphs, Al-Musta`sim bil-Allâh. These two men conspired against the Caliph and handed him over to Hûlâkû, and then they became ministers for the Tatar chieftain.

Ibn Kathîr mentions them in his book *Al-Bidâyah wan-Nihâyah (the Beginning and the End)* and says that Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî worked tirelessly to weaken the Caliph's army, which he finally reduced to ten thousand men. These were starved and impoverished to the point that they had to beg at the doors of mosques, and their salaries had been cut off. Ibn Kathîr says that Muhammad Ibnul-`Alqamî, a fanatical Shia who hated the Sunnis bitterly and wished to make the Shias rise above the Sunnis, was in contact with Hûlâkû, encouraging him to come and seize Baghdad, and was helping him with intelligence about political, military, and economic conditions within the Abbasid capital.

Ibn Kathîr also mentions that when the Tatars appeared at the gates of Baghdad, Nasîrud-Dîn was the first person to go to meet them, taking his family, companions and servants with him. Having met with Hûlâkû, At-Tûsî returned to report to the Caliph Al-Musta`sim and suggested that he go and see Hûlâkû himself. He led Al-Musta`sim to believe that Hûlâkû wanted to negotiate payment of a tribute. Nasîrud-Dîn and Ibnul-`Alqamî then went back with Al-Musta`sim to speak to Hûlâkû, who violently insulted the Caliph and ordered that he be dismissed. Nasîrud-Dîn advised Hûlâkû to kill the Caliph but the latter hesitated. Nasîrud-Dîn persisted urging Hûlâkû to kill Al-Musta`sim, leading him to believe that murdering Al-Musta`sim was an easy matter, until finally Hûlâkû ordered him to be killed. Al-Musta`sim was probably

(Az-Zarkalî, *Al-A`lâm*, vol. 7, p.30). Despite this, Khomeini insists on praising him [At-Tûsî] and wishing him blessings as we shall shortly see.

trampled to death, but some reports say he was strangled. A group of judges and scholars were murdered with him.

Then the Tatars turned their attention to the population of Baghdad; they gathered the men, women, children and old people together and murdered them. The "City of Peace" [Baghdad] was laid to waste. Rivers of blood flowed through its streets and an overpowering stench of death hung over it. The smell of rotten flesh spread out over Iraq and traveled with the winds as far as Syria. Damascus was struck by plague and disease when the foul air of Baghdad drifted its way.³ No one survived the Tatar holocaust except for the Jews and the Christians and, certainly, the Shias, and those who sought refuge at the houses of Ibnul-`Alqamî and Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî.⁴ As mentioned above, these two men became ministers for Hûlâkû after they had been ministers of the careless Abbasid Caliph, Al-Musta`sim.

Epilogue

Some people may ask, what this has to do with us today, and whether it is right to hold all Shias responsible for what Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs and Muhammad Ibnul-`Alqamî did. We certainly cannot hold all the Shia responsible for what those two men did, but those [of the Sunnis] who are attracted by the words of Khomeini, who stirred many Muslims hearts with his promises to return Jerusalem and Afghanistan to the hands of the Muslims, should know that he never fails to praise Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs. He prays for him and asks

3 This is mentioned by Ibn Kathîr, Adh-Dhahabî and Qutbud-Dîn Al-Yunînî.

4 Ibn Kathîr, *Al-Bidâyah wan-Nihâyah*, 7:13, 200, 204, 212, 215, 219, Imam Adh-Dhahabî, *Dîwal Al-Islâm*, p.159.

Allah to have mercy on him⁵, and even says that At-Tûs played a major role in the victory of Islam. Khomeini also said, "People feel a great sense of loss for Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî and others (like him) who provided such a great service to Islam."⁶

It is a great misfortune that the Muslims fail to understand the real meaning of Khomeini's words. Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs was, in fact, responsible for the death of two million Sunni Muslims and this is what Khomeini considers a great service to Islam. This throws fresh light on the crimes of Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûs and Muhammad Ibnul-'Alqamî, who joined forces with the Tatar tyrant. Khomeini asks Allah's pleasure for Nasîrud-Dîn At-Tûsî,⁷ yet the same invocation does not extend to `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb, whom he curses and reviles. Can there be any comparison between `Umar and Nasîrud-Dîn? Can we compare the man who liberated Baghdad and took it from the disbelievers, to the man who delivered it back to them? Why are the Shias so happy with Nasîrud-Dîn and so contemptuous of `Umar Ibnul-Khattâb and Abû Bakr? Is the companion and minister of Hûlâkû more honored in the sight of Allah than the Companions of the Messenger of Allah?

If we understand the past, we can profit from it in the present, by taking it as an example of what could be. In the light of past events, we should be more vigilant in our dealings with the factions whose history is full of treachery and betrayals; who extend the hand of friendship to the enemies of this Ummah (Muslim nation).

5 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.142..

6 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.128.

7 Allah struck him down and he died epileptic.

Considering the history of Islam will provide us with many examples of lessons which our lives do not suffice to experience. Many times these groups have brought misery upon the heads of the Muslims. They are today making their same old claims, and calling people to the same twisted doctrines, that so often moved their ancestors to betray and persecute the Muslims in the past.

The Druze

We should not forget the Druze of Lebanon, who deify Al-Hâkim bi-Amrillâh⁸ and believe in the transmigration of souls. They deny the rising of the dead, insult the Prophet Muhammad, and call him a liar and a fraud in their secret holy book "Messages of Wisdom". We should not forget their shameless conduct toward the Muslims and their alliances with their enemies. The British depended upon them to execute their policies in the Levant, and their true nature was again revealed on the day Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982. Besides, an Israeli brigade of the Druze sect once visited the Druze of Al-Mukhtârah district, where they met with their brethren, the occasion that witnessed festivals and celebrations alongside speeches. In that same year the Druze and the Shia conspired together to strike the Sunnis in Beirut and have subjugated and smashed them.

Further, we should not forget the history of An-Nusayriyyah (the Followers of Muhammad Ibn Nusayr), which is lousy with treacheries. They defy `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib⁹ and believe in a qur`ân

8 The sixth caliph of the Egyptian Fatimid dynasty.

9 It is strangely paradoxical that while the members of that Shia sect, An-Nusayriyyah, deify `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib, they sanctify at the same time `Abdur-Rahmân Ibn Muljim, `Alî's murderer, and `Abdullâh Ibn Saba', the Jew who sowed the seeds of Shiism.

fabricated and written by their leaders, which is totally different from the Glorious Qur'ân known to all Muslims.¹⁰

Though the Twelve-Imam Shias appear to judge An-Nusayriyyah and Ismailis as disbelievers, there is, in fact, practical harmony in the past and the present among the triple.

Engraved into the memory is the period of Al-Hâkim bi-Amrillâh, who ordered to destroy Cairo and set it all ablaze. He killed a huge number of Muslims justifiably and unjustifiably, including his own ministers and counselors to the extent that it was said to him that there were no people left for him to rule.

Besides, one can by no means forget the role played by most of the Shias of Mount `Âmil, who treacherously gave aid and support to the Crusaders.

Regrettably, the enemies of Islam read history through which they become acquainted with those sects and cults of deviated and destructive beliefs, who played a major role in obstructing the Islamic expansion and stood in the way of jihad. It grieves the heart that those enemies make such erring groups play the same role today against the Sunnis.

10 The qur'ân recited and used by An-Nusayriyyah comprises many chapters that are totally different from those of the Glorious Qur'ân, with the exception of some chapter titles derived from those of the Glorious Qur'ân. For example, they have chapters entitled *Ad-Dustûr*, *Taqdîsat Labbayka*, *Taqdîsat Abû Sa'd*, *An-Nisbah*, *As-Sujûd*, *As-Salâm*, *Al-Isbârâh*, *Al-'Ayn*, *Ashbadu Annâ Allâha Haq*, *As-Sûrah Al-Kabîrah*, *Al-Imâmiyyah*, *Al-Khayr*, *At-Tûr* (unlike the chapter of the same name in the Glorious Qur'ân), *Al-Hijâbayn*, *An-Nuqabâ*. All these chapters have nothing to do with the Noble Qur'ân revealed to Prophet Muhammad; they are nothing but polytheistic means through which they invoke and supplicate `Alî Ibn Abû Tâlib for relief and help.

Today we find some people working for Islam who urge us to forget these things. Some of them say that these stories are fabrications; others say they are no longer relevant and only stand in the way of Islamic unity. Yet others maintain that the Shias today have changed, and that the Iranian Shias and others who follow the Twelve Imams really represent a fifth "school of Fiqh," (named Al-Ja'farî School) alongside those of the Imams As-Shâfi'î, Abû Hanîfah, Ibn Hanbal, and Mâlik. They do not take the effort to read even one book of history to see the truth of the aims of these sects and the heretical beliefs they advocate. Some people working in the Islamic call today attempt to justify the false doctrine of the Shias. They ally themselves with them, stand with them, and seek help and assistance from them. This is what they call unity!

Unity is only with those who Acknowledge Divine Unity

Surely, the One Who commanded the Muslims to unite is the same One Who commanded them to disassociate themselves from those who call on other deities besides Allah. He told us how Ibrâhîm (Abraham) denied his people because they were worshipping something else alongside Allah. Allah, Exalted be He, says, *"Indeed, we are disassociated from you and from whatever you worship other than Allah. We have denied you, and there has appeared between us and you animosity and hatred forever until you believe in Allah Alone..."*¹¹

How is it possible to unite with people who sanctify shrines and graves, invoke their dead Imams, and beg them for forgiveness? How can we unite with people who fill whole books with lies about

11 Qur'ân (60:4).

the Prophet, putting false words in his mouth and in the mouths of the members of his Household, whom Allah has raised in honor? How can we unite with people who claim that the Qur'ân has been corrupted, and who insult the Companions of the Prophet, accuse them of distorting the Qur'ân, and reject hadîths narrated by them? How could real unity be achieved with people who abuse the Prophet's wives, especially `Â'ishah and Hafsa, and deem temporary marriage and anal sex with women lawful? Allah's Religion is far above being in need of such fragile, useless unity, with people of such straying beliefs.¹²

12 Khomeini issued a *fatwa* [juristic ruling] confirming the legality of killing the apostate Salman Rushdie, author of the novel *The Satanic Verses*. In his book, Rushdie transgressively lies about Allah and pokes fun at the Companions of the Prophet, and insults the honor of his wives. We have no objection about the basis of this *fatwa*, in principle. Yet, we object to the fact which the Shia scholars neglect to mention and refuse to acknowledge; that the most important and reliable of the Shia sources, such as *Al-Kâfî*, clearly maintains that the Glorious Qur'ân has been distorted and insults the Companions and the wives of the Prophet, upon whom be peace. These books are held in such high esteem that Khomeini said of *Al-Kâfî*, "All the fundamentals and juristic rulings of our religion are contained in *Al-Kâfî*, do you think then that we simply may leave it on the shelf?" (*Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*). There is not very much difference between Salman Rushdie and An-Nûrî At-Tubrasî, the author of the book *Fasl Al-Khitâb fî Ithbât Tabrîf Kitâb Rabil-Arbâb* (*Proof of the Distortion of Allah's Book*), which seeks to prove that the Glorious Qur'ân has been distorted. Any book that raises doubts about the Qur'ân is a satanic book. On this basis, I say that there is no difference between Rushdie and At-Tubrasî for whom Khomeini asks forgiveness from Allah in his book *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah* (p. 68). Both of them [Rushdie and At-Tubrasî] claim that the Glorious Qur'ân has been falsified and they insult its sanctity, and deny Allah's promise to protect and preserve it illustrated in the verse reading, {"Indeed, it is We Who sent down the Message [i.e. the Qur'ân] and indeed, We will be its guardian."} (15:9).

Islam is Unified around a Single Doctrine

The unity of Islam is linked to the unity of True Doctrine. Is it possible, then, to achieve unity between two factions, one that performs prayer facing Mecca and the other that turns its face toward a grave? Between a man who raises his hands to heaven, and one who raises his hands to the graves of Imams at Karbala and Samara?

Tawhîd, the doctrine of divine unity, is the basis of Muslim unity. The unity we seek is not with dead hearts and lifeless bodies. Unity with the Shias, even if possible, would never last long. Genuine unity enjoys the blessings of Allah, and must be based upon the supremacy of the Qur'ân and the *Sunnah*, not at their expense, or at the expense of the honor of the Prophet's wives and Companions.¹³

Unity is a Blessing from Allah

The unity of hearts is a gift from Allah. It is the natural result of the unity of doctrine, sources, and method. By these things, Allah bound the hearts of the pious Salaf (Predecessors) together; Allah Almighty has said, {*"...It is He Who supported you with His help and with the believers – And brought together their hearts. If you had spent all that is in the earth, you could not have brought their hearts together..."*}¹⁴ Allah, Exalted be He, also reminds his worshippers

13 Could the Shias call upon the Sunnis to be in unity with them while the former insult their parents? Are their parents dearer to them than the Companions of the Prophet and the Mothers of the Believers? If there was no goodness in these men and women then there can be no goodness in those who are less than them.

14 Qur'ân 8:62-63.

of this blessing saying, {"*And remember the favor of Allah upon you – when you were enemies and He brought your hearts together and you became, by His favor, brothers.*"}¹⁵

It is our obligation to take a definite and an unambiguous position with respect to those who innovate in religion and those endorsing erring beliefs, be them from outside this nation of Islam or from those who affiliate themselves to it from within the Islamic nation. We must disapprove of whatever is wrong and not simply turn away from it for the sake of unity, which in such a sense would mean inclining toward them. Our actions must be based on forbidding what is wrong,¹⁶ not upon flattery and hypocrisy.

When disobedience, innovation, and disbelief began to appear among the Jews and the Christians, Allah turned their hearts against one another and inspired enmity and hatred among them. This was the result of their distorting what Allah had taught them. They had no chance after this to claim any victory from Allah, nor to rule in His Name, nor to command any authority by virtue of any Revelation that had come to them until they submitted to what they had been taught and applied it. They had no hope of regaining their unity until they rejected the distortions that they had introduced in religion.

It is absolutely imperative that people come out clearly in support of truth, even if this means that those who prefer to follow their own desires abandon it, denounce it and call others to oppose it. The Prophets confronted their people telling them what Allah had required of them, and their people split between those who believed in the message of the Prophets and those who denied it. To

15 Qur'ân (3:103).

16 Arabic: *An-Nabî `an Al-Munkar* [trans].

illustrate by an example, the tribe of Quraysh accused the Prophet, upon whom be peace, of having split their community and broken families up, and likewise denied the faith that he had brought.

The Shia Call to the non-Muslims to Accept Islam

The Shias realize that it is impossible for them to call non-Muslims to their cult, or even to make it seem palatable to outsiders. They know that no one could ever accept Islam on the basis of Shia doctrines. Will people be convinced by insults and curses heaped upon the Companions? Will they make pilgrimages to the graves of the Imams, and to beat themselves with chains and wail and screech? Will they accept that the Qur'an was altered and then take it for their divine book? Naturally, no one enters Islam by the door of Shiism. There is no place in Shiism for calling non-Muslims to Islam. On the contrary, their approach to Islam is always negative. They totally distort the beauty of Islam. Their acts of kidnapping and assassination, and their beating themselves with chains, daggers, and knives before television cameras, is itself sufficient to drive most people away from Islam.

Shia-Christian Dialogue

When a Shia calls a Christian to Islam, the Christian may [rightfully] ask:

"To what exactly you are calling me?"

"I mean to call you to Islam and not to exaggerate about the Messiah [Jesus]," the Shia replies.

"But you exaggerated about Al-Husayn and the Imams to the point that you claim that they were made of light even before the creation of the universe,"¹⁷ the Christian retorts.

"But you call to the Messiah for help and invoke him rather than Allah and call Mary for help," argues the Shia.

"But you too call Al-Husayn and Al-Mahdî for help saying, 'O Husayn!', 'O Mahdî!' and we do the same thing, but we say, 'O Messiah!', 'O Mary!', so what is the difference between us and you?" the Christian asks.

"I am calling you to desist from worshipping the Messiah and not to name your children `Abdul-Masih (i.e. the servant of the Messiah)¹⁸, for the Messiah is a servant of Allah," protests the Shia.

"But do you not name your sons `Abdul-Hasan and `Abdul-Husayn¹⁹ while they were only servants of Allah?" observes the Christian.

"You wish from the Messiah what you wish not from Allah. And you call him for help rather than Allah and you visit the graves of saints and monks," the Shia says.

"You walk around the graves of your Imams and call them for help rather than Allah and give money to the keepers of tombs as penance, and this is precisely what we do with respect to the Messiah and his mother and the apostles and the saints."

"And you lavishly praised the Messiah and exaggerated about him until you ended up worshipping him."

17 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.52.

18 See note 8, p.28 [above].

19 Servant of Al-Hasan and Servant of Al-Husayn are two names used by Shias [*trans*].

"You lavishly praised Al-Husayn and the Imams and went beyond all bounds in aggrandizing them to the point of placing them above the Prophets. You said that they have a magnificent place in heaven beyond that even of the nearest Angels and the Messengers of Allah.²⁰ You claimed that they were incapable of erring and forgetfulness and that they knew all things contained in the heavens and the earth, and that their knowledge is like the wisdom of the Qur'ân. So the Messiah for us is like an Imam for you. We say that belief in the Messiah and love for him are enough for us to enter Paradise, and you said that mere love of the Household of the Prophet is a means of atoning and salvation, and that your love for them cannot be tarnished by evil deeds."

The Shia says, "Your book has been altered and is filled with distortions, things taken out and things added."

The Christian replies, "But you claim that your Qur'ân has been altered and that the Companions added to it and took things from it. You say that there is not any complete and true copy of it other than the one kept with the Invisible Mahdî in his cave!

The Shias, thereon, have been happy with attempting to convert to Shiism the ignorant and those of infirm faith from this noble nation, who are but false scholars claiming to be the servants of Allah while they are in reality only servants to their own greed and ambition.



20 Khomeini, *Al-Hukûmah Al-Islâmiyyah*, p.52.

14

THE SHIAS TODAY

Distorted beliefs must take their toll on the behavior of those who subscribe to them. The behavior of Shias in turn affects negatively the Islamic nation, which witnesses a rise and wakefulness these days. For many people today, Islam has become synonymous with killing and kidnapping, which is just what the enemies of Islam were hoping for. They [the enemies of Islam] fill the front pages of their newspapers with huge headlines about the latest outrage committed by the "Shia Muslims."

The Fruit of Twisted Beliefs

If a single visit to the grave of an Imam is equal to a hundred Pilgrimages to Mecca and is sufficient to guarantee that a person will enter Paradise, then why bother with Mecca? So the hearts of the ignorant are emptied of love for the Sacred City and for the Pilgrimage. The Shias have replaced Sacred House with a grave thus regarding the former with little respect, to the degree that some of them were easily fooled to commit outrageous acts in the Sacred Precincts. They may even be capable of smuggling explosives into Mecca, as they did in 1986 when the plastic explosive C4 was found in the luggage of several Iranian pilgrims. These Iranian Shias can be used to disrupt the pilgrimage in other ways too, as

in 1987 when they organized demonstrations and riots in which hundreds of pilgrims died. The Iranians' excuse was to show their opposition to America and Israel. But, literally days after these events, their "opposition" became even more disclosed with the discovery of secret arms deals between Israel and America on the one hand and Iran on the other hand via Israel, with the Jewish state playing the role of middleman and arranging transport of American arms to Tehran.

In January 1983 television viewers in Germany were shown the passport of Sheikh Sâdiq Tabâtabâ'î, which contained an Israeli stamp. German customs officers also seized 1.8 kg of heroin from his bags. Tabâtabâ'î arrived in Israel on 6 December, 1980 in order to meet with Joseph 'Âzâr, the Israeli contact with the Americans for arranging an arms deal to Tehran. The arms deal between Iran and America was reported in the *Herald Tribune*,¹ in the British news magazine *The Middle East*,² and in the Egyptian weekly *October*.³ Then again, in 1989, a group of Kuwaiti Shias smuggled explosives into Mecca and attacked pilgrims therewith, killing one and injuring others.

The important point here is not to prevent or prohibit somebody from importing arms from whatever source he likes; rather, to show the hypocrisy of the Shias, who threaten the lives of pilgrims to show their opposition to America and Israel on the same day American arms are being shipped to the "Islamic Republic" via Israel.

1 23 August, 1981.

2 January, 1982.

3 August, 1983.

All of this is evidence that the old hatred of the Shias manifested in their books has not yet disappeared, it has rather taken its natural and logical course into the modern age. The distortions of the past, in doctrine and ideology, are ultimately responsible for the rise of such men as Khomeini. So long as these aberrations of belief remain firmly implanted in people's minds, we will continue to be plagued by other "Khomeinis" in the future.



INTRODUCTION

All praise is due to Allah alone, and may Allah exalt the mention of the Messenger of Allah and render him, his household and companions safe from every evil.

I wrote this book for a number of reasons including:

- ☐ The increased efforts of the *Shi'ites* to spread their ideology in the Muslim world,
- ☐ The danger of this deviant sect poses on Islam,
- ☐ The ignorance of many Muslims about the danger of this deviant sect,
- ☐ The corrupt Aqeedah (belief system) of the *Shi'ites*, which includes polytheism, defamation of the Qur'an and defamation of the Companions of the Prophet, may Allah be pleased with them all.
- ☐ Their extreme beliefs in relation to their Imams.

In light of these points, I decided to compile a booklet to clarify the danger of this sect. I have put it together in a brief summarized method, as was the method of our Sheikh Abdullah B. Abdurrahmann al-Jibreen, may Allah preserve him, in his book 'Commentary on the Text of Lum'atil I'tiqaad'.

I have taken quotes from the famous *Shi'ite* source books and from the books of *Ahlus-Sunnah* who refuted the beliefs of the *Shi'ites* and clarified the incorrectness of their beliefs, which is based on polytheism, extremism, lies, slander, and defamation.

I have tried in this short, humble work to condemn them from their own books and works as Sheikh Ibrahim b. Sulaiman al-Jabhan, may Allah have mercy on him, said: '*O Shi'ite, I will condemn you from your own words!*'

In the end, I ask Allah to benefit those who have intellects as Allah says:

{'Indeed in that is a reminder for whoever has a heart or who listens while he is present [in mind]'.} (Qur'an 50:37)

I am thankful to all those who helped me prepare this booklet. I ask Allah to reward them for their help.

Allah knows best, and may Allah exalt the mention of our Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) and render him, his household and his companions safe from every evil. Ameen

Abdullah Ibn Muhammad As-Salafi

WHEN DID THE SHI'ITE SECT FIRST APPEAR?

The Rejectionists¹ came into existence when a Jewish man (Abdullah b. Saba') claimed to have become Muslim; he claimed to love the family of the Messenger of Allah and held extreme beliefs regarding Ali. He claimed that Ali was the rightful heir to the Caliphate after the death of Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ). He then elevated the status of Ali to a divine one, as is mentioned in the *Shi'ite* source books.

Al-Qum'mi in his book '*Al-Maqalat wal-Firaq*' (Articles and Sects)² admits that he existed and considers him to be the first to believe in the authority of Ali and he was the first to have condemned Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman and the other Companions, this has also been mentioned by an-Nobakhti in his book '*Shi'ite* Sects'³ and by al-Kish'shi in his famous book '*Rijaal al-Kish'shi*' (the Men of al-Kish'shi).⁴

1 *Shi'ites* are called 'Rejectionists' for the following reasons: the first is due to their rejection of the first two caliphs of Islam, Abu Bakr and Umar, the second reason is when they went to Zaid b. Ali b. al-Husain and they asked of him to reject and condemn Abu Bakr and Umar he said: 'They are my companions.' The *Shi'ites* said to him, we will then 'reject' you, and from this they were called '*Raafidhab*' i.e. rejectionists.

2 *Al-Maqalat wal-Firaq* for al-Qum'mi pg.10-21

3 *Firaq ash-Shi'at* for an-Nobakhti pg.19-20.

4 *Al-Kish'shi* mentioned a number of narrations about Abdullah b. Saba and his beliefs. Look at 170,171,172,173,174 on pg.106-108.

Muhammad Ali al-Mual'lim, a present day *Shi'ite*, also affirmed the existence of Abdullah b. Saba' in his book "Abdullah b. Saba- The Unknown Reality"⁵. As it has been said, '*Recognition is the best of evidences*'. The names previously mentioned are among the Grande *Shi'ite* scholars.

Al-Baghdadi said, '*As-Saba'iyah, the followers of Abdullah b. Saba', held extreme beliefs regarding Ali. They claimed him to be a Prophet and even ascribed divinity to him, claiming he was Allah!*'

Al-Baghdadi also said, '*Tbn as-Soda', i.e. Abdullah b. Saba', was a Jew from Heerah, who claimed to be a Muslim. He wanted to become powerful in the Kufa area, so he told them that he found in the Torah that every Prophet would have a regent and the regent of Prophet Muhammad was Ali.*'

Ash-Shihristani mentioned that the first to call to the Imamate of Ali was Ibn Saba'. He also mentioned that the Saba'iyah was the first sect to bring about the belief in the absence of the Imam and other authoritative sources. This was then inherited by the various *Shi'ite* sects afterwards. The ideas of the Imamate of Ali and his rightful authority to the Caliphate are of the remnants of Ibn Saba'.

In this manner the belief and principle of regency, authoritative sources, absence of the Imam and attribution of divinity to these Imams⁶ was brought about by Abdullah b. Saba' the Jew.



5 This book is a refutation of a book written by a *Shi'ite* known as 'Murtada al-Askari' entitled: 'Abdullah b. Saba' and other False Narrations' in which he rejected that anyone known as Abdullah b. Saba' ever existed.

6 The Fundamentals of the Beliefs of *Ablus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah* for al-'La'laka'ee.

WHY ARE SHI'ITES CALLED 'REJECTIONISTS'?

The reason for this name was mentioned by the *Shi'ite* Scholar al-Majlisi in his book '*Bihaar al-Anwaar*'. He said: '*Chapter: The Virtues of the Rejectionists and Honor of this Name.*' He mentioned a narration on the authority of Sulaiman al-A'mush, 'I entered upon Abu Abdullah Ja'far b. Muhammad, and I said: 'May I be your ransom, people call us 'Rawaafidh' (i.e. Rejectionists), who are the Rawaafidh? He said: 'By Allah, they have not given you this name; this is a name given to you by Allah in the Torah and the Gospels and was mentioned by Prophets Musa and Jesus.'⁷

It has been said that they were called 'Rejectionists' because they approached Zaid b. Ali al-Husain and they said: 'Disown Abu Bakr and Umar, so that we can join you.' He said: 'They are the Companions of my grandfather, and I stand by them.' They said: 'We will then disown you.' They were then called '*Raafidhah*' (i.e. Rejectionists) and those who joined him were called '*Zaidiyah*'.⁸

It also has been said that they were called by this name on account of their disavowal of the Caliphates of Abu Bakr and Umar.⁹



7 *Bihaar al-Anwaar* for al-Majlisi 97/65.

8 Commentary on the Text of Lum'atul I'tiqad by Sheikh Abdullah al-Jibreen, may Allah preserve him, pg.108

9 Commentary of Islamic Articles for Muhyi ad-Deen Abdul-Hamid (1/89).

HOW MANY SHI'ITES SECTS ARE THERE?

In the Encyclopedia '*Dairatul Ma'arif*' it is mentioned: 'Many *Shi'ite* sects appeared, the number has far exceeded the 73 known sects that splintered away from Islam.'¹⁰

The Rafidhi Meer Baqir ad-Damaad, said, 'all the 73 sects mentioned in the *Hadith* are in relation to the *Shi'ite* sects and the successful one is the Imamate sect.'¹¹

Al-Maqrizi mentioned that the *Shi'ite* sects are more than 300.¹²

Ash-Shihraṣṭani said: '*The Rejectionists can be categorized into five groups: al-Kaisaniyah, Az-Zaidiyah, Imamiyah, al-Ghaliyah, and Ismailiyah.*'¹³

Al-Baghdadi said: '*The Rejectionists after Ali divided into four groups: Zaidiyah, Imamiyah, Kaisaniyah and Ghulaat.*'¹⁴

10 Da'iratul Ma'arif 4/67.

11 He is Baqir b. Muhammad al-Istarbadi, known as 'Meer Damaad'. He died in 1041H. You can see more information on him in the book 'Al-Kuna wal-Alqaab' for Abbas al-Qummi.

12 Look at al-Khitat 2/351..

13 Al-Milal wan-Nihal for ash-Shihraṣṭani pg.147.

14 Al-Farq bainal Firaq for al-Baghdadi pg. 41

It should be noted that the only group among the Zaidiyah that are considered Rawaafidh are the Jaroodiyah sect.



THE BELIEF OF AL-BADA' WHICH THE RAFIDHAH BELIEVE IN

Al-Bada' means to appear after having been hidden. It also refers to the birth of a new opinion. Both these meanings suggest that ignorance preceded knowledge and are impossible in the right of Allah, but the Rafidhah impute this to Allah, the Exalted.

Ar-Rayan b. as-Sult said: *'I heard ar-Ridha saying: "Allah has not sent a Prophet but to prohibit intoxicants and affirm the belief of al-Bada' for Allah."*¹⁵

Abu Abdullah said: *'Allah has not been worshipped with anything better than believing that he is affected by al-Bada'.*¹⁶ Far removed is Allah from this imperfection! Dear brother, look at how they impute ignorance to Allah! Allah says:

{Say, "None in the heavens and earth knows the unseen except Allah, and they do not perceive when they will be resurrected.}
(Qur'an 27:65)

15 *Usool al-Kafi* pg.40

16 *Usool al-Kafi* for al-Kulaini vol 1 pg.331.

At the same time, they state that their Imams know everything and nothing is hidden from them!

Is this the Message of Islam that our Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) was ordered to convey?



WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAWAFIDH IN RELATION TO THE ATTRIBUTES OF ALLAH

The *Raafidhah* were the first deviant sect to believe in the creed of at-Tajseem, which is to ascribe human qualities to Allah.

Sheikh al-Islam b. Taymiyyah stated that the one who introduced this belief to the Rawaafidh were Hisham b. al-Hakam¹⁷, Hisham b. Salim al-Jawaliqi, Yunus b. Abdurrahman al-Qum'mi and Abu Ja'far al-Ahwal.¹⁸ These Sheikhs are among the Grande scholars of the 12 Imamate sect of *Shi'ites*. From this it is clear, that they became Jahmiyah in relation to the attributes of Allah.

Ibn Babawaih narrated over seventy narrations which state that Allah is not to be attributed with a time, place or to be described. No movement is attributed to Him or any actual motions.¹⁹ Their

17 *Minhaj as-Sunnah* vol.1 pg.20.

18 Beliefs of Muslim and Polytheist Sects pg.97.

19 At-Tawhid by Ibn Babweih pg.57

scholars then continued upon this deviant path and suspended the attributes of Allah that are mentioned in the Qur'an and *Sunnah*.

They also deny that Allah comes down to the Lowest Heaven. They claim the Qur'an is created and reject that a Muslim will see Allah in the Hereafter, as is mentioned in *Bihaar al-Anwaar*. It is stated there that Abu Abdullah Jafar as-Sadiq was asked about Allah, 'Will we see Allah on the Day of Resurrection?' He said: '*SubhanAllah* (far removed is Allah from every imperfection)! The eyes can only see things with color and shape, and Allah is the creator of color and shape!'²⁰

They stated that if one was to attribute to Allah some attributes such as the fact that believers will see Him on the Day of Resurrection, that person will become an apostate, as is mentioned by their Sheikh Jafar an-Najafi.²¹ Nonetheless, we have to affirm that a believer will see Allah on the Day of Resurrection, for He, the Exalted, says:

{"To your Rubb, that Day, is the [place of] permanence. Man will be informed that Day of what he sent ahead and kept back."}
(*Qur'an* 75:22-3)

Also in the *Sunnah* there is the *Hadith* of Jarir b. Abdullah al-Bujali. He said: 'We were sitting with the Prophet (ﷺ) and he looked at the moon on the 14th night, and said: 'You will see your Rubb as you see this moon, clearly without a shed of doubt.'²²

20 *Bihaar al-Anwaar* for al-Majlisi vol. 4 pg.31

21 *Kashf al-Ghata* pg.417

22 *Saheeh al-Bukhari* #455 and *Muslim* #633.

There are many *Hadith* and verses of the Qur'an that mention this as well, we cannot mention them all here.²³



WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAWAAFIDH IN RELATION TO THE QUR'AN THAT WE HAVE TODAY?

The *Raafidhah* of today, known as the *Shi'ites* state that the Qur'an we have in our possession is not the Qur'an that was revealed to Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ). They claim it has been tampered with and verses have been removed and others put in.

The majority of the *Shi'ite* Traditionalists believe that the Qur'an has been tampered with as is mentioned by an-Noori at-Tabrisi in his book: *'Faslul-Khetaab fi Tahreef Ke'tab Rab'bil Arbaab'*.

Muhammad b. Yaqoob al-Kulaini said in his book *'Usool al-Kafi'* under the chapter: **'No one was able to gather the Qur'an except for the Imams'**: 'Jabir said that Abu Ja'far said: 'No one claims to have gathered the Qur'an, but is a liar. No one was able to gather it and memorize it as it was revealed by Allah except Ali b. Abi Talib and the Imams that came after him.'

Jabir also reported that Abu Jafar said: 'No one can claim to have gathered the entire Qur'an except for the Imams.'

23 Look at the books of Tawhid that detail the beliefs of *Ahlus-Sunnah al-Jama'ah*.

Hisham b. Salim reported that Abu Abdullah said: 'Indeed the Qur'an that was brought by Jibreel to Muhammad had 17000 verses.'

This means that the Qur'an the *Raafidhah* claim to have is more than the Qur'an we have today by three times! We seek refuge with Allah from them!

Ahmed at-Tabrasi said in his book: '*Al-Ihtijaa'*' that Umar said to Zaid b. Thabit: 'Indeed Ali brought the Qur'an while in it the shameful affairs of the *Muhajireen* and Ansar were unveiled.' Zaid attested to this, and then said: 'When I finish gathering the Qur'an as you have instructed me to do, will not the complete Qur'an that is with Ali render my work void?' Umar said: 'What should we do?' Zaid said: 'You know better how to make tricks!' Umar then said: 'There is no solution, except that we kill him and are at peace from him. He then panned out a scheme to kill him through Khalid b. al-Walid, but he was incapable of carrying it out.'

When Umar became the *Khalifah*, he asked Ali to give him the Qur'an, so that he could change it. Umar said: 'O Abul-Hasan, why don't you bring forth the Qur'an, which you presented to Abu Bakr, so that we can gather upon it.' He said: 'Impossible, do not even try! I only brought it forth to Abu Bakr so that the evidences could be established against him and so that you would not say on the Day of Resurrection: 'We were ignorant of this' or that you say: 'You have not brought it forth.' This Qur'an can only be touched by the pure and the regents of the Prophet. Umar said: 'Will there be a time wherein it will be made apparent?' Ali said: 'Yes, when the Mahdi comes forth, he will make it apparent.'

No matter how much the *Shi'ites* appear to have cast aside the book of an-Noori at-Tabrasi, an apparent display of Taqiyyah, this book holds hundreds of textual evidences from their scholars

and from their own source books, which clearly proves that they believe the Qur'an we have today is distorted, but because they do not want to cause a commotion regarding their beliefs about the Qur'an, they try to distance themselves from this belief.

So it seems that there are two versions of the Qur'an; the first is known to us and the second is a secret, hidden away from the eyes of people. Of the chapters that are hidden away is the chapter of *al-Wilayah*, which the *Shi'ites* claim was removed from the Qur'an, as was mentioned by An-Noorsi at-Tabrasi in his book: *Faslul Khitaab fi Tahreef ke'taab rab'bil arbaab*. He also mentioned that a verse '*wa rafa'na laka dhikrak*' which they claim was dropped from Surat ash-Sharh (Chapter 94).

The *Shi'ites* are not ashamed to say this openly, even though it is well known that this chapter was revealed in Makkah and Ali at that time was not married to the Prophet's daughter.



WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAAFIDHAH IN RELATION TO THE COMPANIONS OF THE PROPHET (ﷺ)?

The *Raafidhah* swear at them and impute disbelief to them, may Allah be pleased with all the Companions. Al-Kulaini said in his book *Foroo al-Kafi* that Ja'far said: 'People apostatized after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ) except for three.' He was asked, 'Who are

the three?' He said: 'Al-Miqdad b. al-Aswad, Abu Dharr al-Ghifari and Salman al-Farsi.'²⁴

Al-Majlisi said in '*Bihaar al-Anwaar*' that a freed slave of Ali b. al-Husain said: 'I was with Ali during his free time and I said to him: 'Indeed I have a right to know about Abu Bakr and Umar. He said: 'They are *Kaafir*; whoever loves them is *Kaafir* as well.'²⁵

On the authority of Abu Hamzah ath-Thumali that he asked Ali b. al-Husain about Abu Bakr and Umar and he said: 'They are *Kaafir*; whoever stands with them is *Kaafir* as well.' In the Tafsir of al-Qummi, at the exegesis of verse 90 of Surah an-Nahl:

"Indeed, Allah orders justice and good conduct and giving to relatives and forbids immorality and bad conduct and oppression" (Qur'an 16 :90)

He said: 'Immorality signifies Abu Bakr, bad conduct signifies Umar and oppression signifies Uthman.'²⁶

Al-Majlisi in *Bihaar al-Anwaar* said: 'The reports that indicate the apostasy of Abu Bakr, Umar and their likes, and the reward of cursing them and declaring one's innocence from them are great in number and cannot all be mentioned in this volume or in many volumes. What we have mentioned is sufficient for him whom Allah wants to guide.'²⁷

24 *Foroo al-Kafi* pg.115

25 *Bihaar al-Anwaar*, by Al-Majlisi vol.69 pg.137-8. It is important for us to note that Ali b. al-Husain and all the family of the Prophet are innocent of these lies that have been fabricated by the *Raafidhah*.

26 Tafsir al-Qummi vol.1/390

27 *Bihaar al-Anwaar* vol. 30/230

Al-Majlisi has mentioned in *Bihaar al-Anwaar* many narrations that indicate that Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman and Muawiyah, may Allah be pleased with them all, are in caskets of Fire, we seek refuge with Allah from this evil!²⁸

In his book *Thqaaq al-Haq* al-Mar'ishi, said: *'Al'laahum'ma sal'lee ala Muhammad wa ala Aa'lee Muhammad wul'an sanamai Quraish wa jibtaihim wa taghootaihim wabnatai'hema.'* Meaning: 'O Allah praise Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) and the family of Muhammad (ﷺ) and curse the 'two idols' of Quraish and their two *Jibt* (superstitious) and *Taghoot* (false objects of worship) and their two daughters.' Meaning: Abu Bakr and Umar, and their daughters A'ishah and Hafsa, may Allah be pleased with them all.

Al-Majlisi in his treatise known as '*Al-Aqaa'id*' (The Creeds) said: 'What is known by necessity in the Imamate faith, is the lawfulness of Mut'ah marriage (temporary marriage), *Tamat'tu* Hajj and declaring one's self innocent from 'Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, and Mu'awiyah, Yazid b. Muawiyah and all those who fought against Ali, may Allah be pleased with him.'

On the Day of *Aashoorah*, a dog is paraded and is called 'Umar', and is then mercilessly beaten with sticks and stones until it dies. A goat is then paraded which is called 'A'ishah', and its hair is plucked and it is beaten by shoes until it dies.²⁹

They also celebrate the day in which Umar al-Farooq was assassinated. To honor his killer, Abu Lo'loah al-Majoosi, they

28 *Bihaar al-Anwaar* vol. 30/236

29 *Tabdeed adth-Dthalam wa Tanbeeh an-Ne'yaam* by Sh.Ibrahim al-Jabhan pg.27.

call him: '*Baba Shujaa ad-Deen*.' May Allah be pleased with all the Companions and wives of the Prophet, may Allah praise him.

Dear brother/sister in Islam, look at how this deviant sect despises the best of creation after the Prophets and Messengers. Allah and His Messenger both have praised them and the Ummah has unanimously come to know of their trustworthiness, virtue and merit and Jihad in the path of Allah.



COMMON TRAITS BETWEEN JEWS AND RAAFIDHAH

Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said: 'The sign of this is that the ordeal of the *Raafidhah* is similar to that of the Jews. The Jews said kingship can only be in the family of Dawood and the *Raafidhah* said that Imamate can only be from the children of Ali.'

The Jews said: 'There can be no Jihad in the path of Allah until the Pseudo-Christ emerges forth and the command to fight is given. The *Raafidhah* said: 'There is no Jihad in the path of Allah until the Mahdi emerges and a caller calls from the heavens to fight.'

The Jews delay their prayers till the stars are ablaze at night and the *Raafidhah* delay the Maghrib prayer till that time at night. The Prophet (ﷺ) said:

*“My Ummah will be in a state of good affairs as long as they do not delay the Maghrib prayer till the stars are ablaze at night.”
(Ahmed, Abu Dawood and Ibn Majah -Hasan)*

The Jews distorted the Torah, as did the *Raafidhah* with the Qur'an. The Jews do not see it lawful to wipe over the socks during ablution, as is the belief of the *Raafidhah*.

The Jews despise Jibreel, and they say: ‘He is our enemy from amongst the Angels.’ The *Raafidhah* say: ‘Jibreel made a mistake in giving the *Wahi* (revelation) to Prophet Muhammad.’³⁰

The *Raafidhah* also agreed with the Christians in relation to the dowry; they do not give their wives dowry, for the *Raafidhah* believe in temporary marriages and see it as lawful.

The Jews and Christians are better than the *Raafidhah*, for when the Jews were asked who the best of all Jews were, they replied ‘the companions of Musa’ and when the Christians were asked who the best of all Christians were, they said the companions of Jesus. And when the *Raafidhah* were asked who the worst amongst them were, they said the Companions of Prophet Muhammad.³¹

The Jews divide people into two categories, Jews and other nations. The other nations include anyone who is not a Jew. The Jews believe that they themselves are the believers. As for other nations, they believe them to be polytheists, disbelievers who know

30 There is a group of *Raafidhah* who claim that Jibreel was treacherous in delivering the Message and gave it to Muhammad instead. Ali was more righteous than the Prophet in this regard! Dear Muslim look at this flagrant lie, Allah says: "The Trustworthy Spirit [i.e. Gabriel] has brought it down" what do you say about this belief my dear Muslim?

31 *Minhaj as-Sunnah* for Sheikh Islam b. Taymiyyah 1/24.

nothing about Allah. It is mentioned in the Talmud: '*All nations other than the Jews are polytheists*'. Their Rabbis inculcate this teaching among the Jews. Jesus himself was not safe from their treachery. In the Talmud it is mentioned that Jesus was a '*disbeliever who knew nothing about Allah*'.

The *Raafidhah* believe themselves to be the only believers; all other groups other than them are non-Muslim, who have apostatized and have no share in Islam. The reason the *Raafidhah* impute disbelief to other Muslims is that they do not recognize the *Wilayah* (guardianship/power) of their Imams. The *Raafidhah* consider this to be a pillar of Islam. According to them, a Muslim who does not believe in *Wilayah* is a non-believer, similar to a Muslim who disbelieves in the Testimony of Faith and prayers. The *Wilayah* is given priority over all the pillars of Islam.

Al-Burqi narrated that Abu Abdullah said: 'There is no true believer except us and our *Shi'ite* brethren, and all other people are not true believers.'

In the exegesis of al-Qummi it is narrated that Abu Abdullah said: 'There is no one on the religion of Islam except us until the Day of Resurrection.'³²



32 Badthlol Majhood fe Moshabahtil Rafidhah bil Yahood for Abdullah al-Jamili 2/599 and 568.

WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAFIDHAH IN RELATION TO THEIR IMAMS?

The *Raafidhah* claim that their Imams are infallible and that they know the unseen. Al-Kulaini mentioned in *Usool al-Kaafi*: 'Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq said: 'We are the keepers of the knowledge of Allah, we are the interpreters of the commands of Allah. We are infallible, it has been ordered that we be obeyed and not disobeyed. We are the clear sign of Allah on the earth and in the heavens.'

Al-Kulaini says in *al-Kafi*: '*Chapter: If the Imams wish to know they will know.*' Ja'far said: 'Indeed if an Imam wishes to know he will know. The Imams know when they will die, and they only die by choice.'

Al-Khomeini mentioned in his book '*Tahreer al-Waseelah*': 'Indeed our Imams have an exalted status, a lofty position and a natural caliphate to which all creation submits.' He also said: 'The twelve Imams have lofty positions with Allah. No close Angel or beloved Prophet has reached that position.'³³

The *Raafidhah* adulate their Imams so much so that they favor them over all Prophets except Prophet Muhammad. Al-Majlisi mentioned in his book '*Miraat al-Uqool*': 'The twelve Imams are greater and better than all the Prophets except for our Prophet Muhammad.'

33 Tahreer al-Waseelah for al-Khomeini pg.52, 94.

The *Raafidhah* even said, 'the Imams are the rightful caliphs of all creation.'

Al-Kho'ie said in his book: 'Misbah *al-Fuqahah*': 'There is no doubt regarding their guardianship over the creation as is clear from the narrations, for they are the reason behind the creation. Through them creation is brought about and from them life comes forth. Had it not been for them, the creation would not be brought into existence. This Wilayah is similar to that of Allah's power over creation.'³⁴

We seek refuge with Allah from this extremism and deviation!

How can those Imams be the 'reason behind creation?' How can they be instrumental in the creation of all people? How can people be created for the sake of the Imams? Allah says:

{ "And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me" } (Qur'an 51:56)

We seek refuge with Allah from these devious beliefs which are distant from the Qur'an and *Sunnah*.

Sheikh Islam b. Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said: 'The *Raafidhah* claim that the Deen is given to the Rabbis and Monks who then decide what is Halal (lawful) and what is Haram (unlawful), to them the Deen is that which their Imams have sanctioned for them.'³⁵

34 Miraat al-Uqool fe sharh Akhbaar aalir-rasool. Al-Majlisi 2/290

35 *Minhaj as-Sunnah* for Ibn Taymiyyah (1/482)

Dear reader, if you want to see open polytheism and disbelief you have but to read the following lines of poetry said by their Sheikh Ibrahim al-Aa'mili, who talks about Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him:

*Abu Hasan you are the eye of the God
You are the sign of His lofty abilities
You are the one who knows the unseen
Nothing escapes your infinite knowledge
You are the controller of all creation
To you belong its large bodies of water.
To you belongs the command,
you but wish and you will live tomorrow*

Another whose name is Ali b. Sulaiman al-Mazidi said upon praising Ali b. Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him:

*O Abu Hasan you are the husband of al-Butool
You are the side of the God and the Soul of the Messenger
You are the full moon and the sunshine of the intellect
The Prophet called you on the unsettled day
And stated that you were to lead in al-Ghadeer
For you are the leader of all believers
All affairs are approved by you
And you know all that is in the chests of men
You are the one who commands,
what is in the graves to come together
The affairs of the Last Day are under your discretion
You are the All-Hearing you are the all-Seeing
You are powerful over all affairs
Had it not been for you no star would move
Had it not been for you no heavenly body would move
You know all the affairs of the creation*

*Had it not been for you,
Musa would not be spoken to by Allah
Far removed is He who formed you the way you are
Loving you is like the sun that goes above all creation
May he who hates you never experience any success
All the prophets and messengers and all of creation
Are but your slaves and your creation
O Abu Hasan you are the controller of all creation
To you return all those who are in need of help
When I am in trouble I remember your name
With your love, I shall enter your Jannah*

Will a Muslim who believes in Islam utter something like this?
By Allah, even the polytheists who were around before the advent
of Islam never said a thing like this!



WHAT IS THE REALITY BEHIND
THE BELIEF OF 'AR-RAJ'AH' THAT
THE RAAFIDHAH BELIEVE IN?

The *Raafidhah* have innovated the idea of '*Ar-Raj'ah*' (return to life after death). Al-Mofeed said: 'The Imamates unanimously agree that many of the dead will be brought back to life.'

They believe that their last Imam 'Al-Qa'im' who will emerge towards the end of time from his tunnel, will slaughter all his opponents, including those who didn't agree with him in political

issues. He will give back the *Shi'ites* their rights that have been taken away from them throughout the ages.³⁶

As-Sayyid al-Mortada said in his book '*Al-Masail an-Nasiriyah*' that Abu Bakr and Umar will both be crucified on a tree that will be known during the time of al-Mahdi, who is their twelfth Imam. To them he is known as *Qa'im Aali Muhammad*. The tree they will supposedly be crucified on will be a healthy one and will turn dry after they are crucified on it.³⁷

Al-Majlisi said in his book '*Haq al-Yaqeen*' that Muhammad al-Baqir said: 'When the Mahdi appears, he will revive A'ishah, mother of the believers, and will administer on her the proper castigatory punishment.'³⁸

The concept of '*Ar-Raj'ah*' has witnessed much development. It has been stated that all the *Shi'ite* Imams will be brought back to life along with all their opponents.

This ridiculous belief actually shows you the enmity they hold against Muslims. Surprisingly enough this belief was used to reject the belief in the Last Day.

Basically, this belief deals with revenge from the opponents of the *Shi'ites*. The question that has to be asked is who are the opponents of the *Shi'ites*? The following narration shows you the hatred the *Shi'ites* harbor in themselves against the Sunni Muslims and how closely they stand with the Christians and Jews. Al-Majlisi mentioned in his book '*Bihaar al-Anwaar*' that

36 Awa'il al-Maqalat by al-Mofeed pg.51.

37 Al-Khotoot al-Areedah by Muhib'bid deen al-Khateeb pg.80.

38 Haq al-Yaqeen by Muhammad al-Baqir pg.347

Abu Basir related that Abu Abdullah said that he said to me: 'O Abu Muhammad, its as though I am witnessing the time in which al-Qa'im will descend in as-Sahlah Mosque with his wives and family.' It was then mentioned: 'What will happen to the people of *Dhimmah* (i.e. Christians and Jews)? He said: 'We will make a treaty with them as the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) did. They are to give *Jizyah* (head tax) in a lowly manner.' I asked: 'How about those who opposed you?' He said: 'No Abu Muhammad, those who oppose us have no share in our state. Allah has legalized for us to shed their blood when Qa'im comes forth. Today it is unlawful for us to do this, let no one fool you. When al-Qa'im comes forth he will avenge for us and for the Messenger of Allah.'³⁹

Dear brother/sister in Islam look at how the Mahdi of the *Shi'ites* will make peace with the Jews and Christians and fight the Sunni Muslims! One may say, those who will be killed are those who openly display enmity towards them, and *Ahlus-Sunnah* do not hold enmity towards the family of the Prophet (ﷺ). In response to this, we say: 'There are many narrations in which the *Raafidhah* talk about the *Nasibah*, and when explained those who are meant by this are the Sunni Muslims.'

One can read '*Al-Mahaasin an-Nafsaaniyah*' by Husain Aal Asfoor ad-Drazi al-Bahrani and the book '*Ash-Shehab ath-Thaqib fee bayan ma'na an-Naasib*' by Yousef al-Bahrani.



39 *Bibaar al-Anwaar* for al-Majlisi 52/376

WHAT IS THE REALITY BEHIND THE BELIEF OF 'AT-TUQYAH' THAT THE RAAFIDHAH BELIEVE IN?

At-Tuqyah was defined by one of the present day scholars as: 'To say or do something which conflicts with your belief when you need to alleviate a harm that may befall you, your wealth or your honor.'

They said that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) practiced it when Abdullah b. Ubai b. Salool, the head of the hypocrites, passed away. When the Prophet (ﷺ) went to perform prayers on him, Umar said to him: 'Hasn't Allah forbade you to do so?' The Prophet (ﷺ) replied: 'Woe to you! Do you know what I said? I said: "O Allah fill his mouth with fire, fill his grave with fire, and admit him into Hell-Fire."⁴⁰

Look at how they impute these lies to the Prophet (ﷺ)! Is it logical that the Companions all ask Allah to have mercy on him, while the Prophet of mercy curses him?!

Al-Kulaini mentioned in his book '*Usool al-Kafi*': 'Abu Abdullah said, O Abu Umar, 9/10ths of the faith is in *Tuqyah*. He who has no *Tuqyah* has no faith! *Tuqyah* is to be used in every part of the faith except in alcohol and wiping over the socks.' Al-Kulaini also reported that Abu Abdullah said: 'Fear for your

40 *Furoo al-Kafi*, Book of Funerals, pg.188

Deen, hide it away with *Tuqyah*! The one who has no *Tuqyah* has no faith.⁴¹

It is also lawful according to the *Shi'ites* to swear by other than Allah in respect to *Tuqyah*, we seek refuge with Allah!

Al-Hurr al-Aamili in his book '*Wasail ash-She'at*' mentioned that Ibn Bukair mentioned that Zurarah mentioned that Abu Ja'far said: 'We indeed pass by those people who ask us to swear by our wealth of which we have paid out its *Zakah* (compulsory charity).' He said: 'O Zurarah if you are in a state of fear, make an oath with whatever they want you to swear by.' He said: 'May I be your ransom, even by divorce and emancipation of a slave.' He said: 'by whatever they want.'

Sa'ma'ah related that Abu Abdullah said: 'If a person makes an oath with *Tuqyah*, he will not be harmed if he is forced and needs to use it.'

The *Raafidhah* see *Tuqyah* a must and their religion is not complete without it. They are 'fed' its secrets in public and in private. They use it when they are in a tight situation. O Muslims beware of the *Shi'ites*!



41 *Usool al-Kafi* pg.482-3

WHAT IS THE REALITY BEHIND THE BELIEF OF 'AT-TEENAH' THAT THE RAAFIDHAH BELIEVE IN?

This belief pertains to the soil of the grave of al-Husain, may Allah be pleased with him. One of their deviants, Muhammad an-Nu'man al-Harithi known as 'Ash-Sheikh al-Mofeed' (i.e. the beneficial Sheikh), mentioned in his book '*Al-Mazar*' that Abu Abdullah said: 'In the soil of the grave of al-Husain there is a cure from every sickness and it is the greatest cure.'

Abdullah said: 'Put the soil of al-Husain in the mouths of your children.'

He said: 'Some clothes were sent to Abu al-Husain ar-Rida from Khurasan, in which was some soil. He asked the Messenger: 'What is this?' He said: 'Soil from the grave of al-Husain, he does not send any clothes or anything else unless there is a portion of this soil in that thing.' He would say: 'This is a sign of safety, by the will of Allah.'

The man asked as-Sadiq about taking the soil of the grave of al-Husain and as-Sadiq said to him: 'When you take it, say: "O Allah I ask you by the right of the king who took it, and by the right of the Prophet who stored it, and by the right of the proper appointee to praise the Prophet Muhammad and his family and to make it a cure from every disease and a security from every fear and a protection from every evil.'

Abu Abdullah was asked about using the soil from the grave of Hamzah and Al-Husain and the merit of each, and he said: 'The *Dhikr* beads that are formed from the soil of the grave of al-Husain make *Dhikr* by themselves without anyone making *Dhikr* with them.'

The *Raafidhah* believe that the *Shi'ite* is created from a special soil unlike that which the Sunni was created from. The two soils then mixed together; so any *Shi'ite* that does evil, it is on account of the 'Sunni' soil that is within him, and on the Day of Resurrection they believe that the sins that the *Shi'ites* have committed will then be cast upon the Sunni Muslims and the good deeds of the Sunni Muslims will be given to the *Shi'ites*!



WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAAFIDHAH IN RELATION TO SUNNI MUSLIMS

The belief of the *Raafidhah* in relation to the Sunni Muslims is that the blood of a Sunni Muslim is lawful to shed and their wealth is lawful for them to acquire forcefully.

As-Sadooq mentioned in *al-E'lal* a narration that traces back to Abu Dawood b. Farqad that he said that Abu Abdullah said to him, 'What do you say about the *Naasibi* (i.e. Sunni Muslim)?' he said: 'His blood is lawful for us to shed. If you can kill him by pushing a wall over so that he is crushed or by drowning him in a

sea, so that no witnesses are there, then do so!" I then asked him about his wealth and he said: 'Take it if you can.'⁴²

The *Raafidhah* claim that their newborn children are pure unlike any other child, for they are impure. Hashim al-Bahrani states in his exegesis '*Al-Burhan*' that Maitham b. Yahya reported that Ja'far b. Muhammad said: 'No newborn is born except that a devil is in his company. Once the devil knows that the newborn is a *Shi'ite* the newborn would be protected from that devil. If he is not a *Shi'ite* the devil will put his finger in the child's anus and that child will become a hermaphrodite, and a natural sinner at which point the baby will cry upon exiting the womb of his mother.'

The *Raafidhah* claim that all people are children of fornication except themselves! Al-Kulaini in his book '*Ar-Rodah minal Kafi*' mentioned a narration on the authority of Abu Hamza that Abu Ja'far said: 'I said: "Some of our companions swear at the chaste people from amongst those who do not believe as we believe.' He said to me: 'It is better for one to stop this, and he then said: "By Allah O Abu Hamzah, all people are children of whores except for our *Shi'ites*.'"'⁴³

The *Shi'ites* believe that the disbelief of the Sunni Muslims is greater and worse than the disbelief of the Christians and Jews. According to them the Christians and Jews are 'original' disbelievers and the Sunni Muslims are apostates, and apostasy is worse than disbelief; that is why they have helped and continuously help Christians and Jews against the Sunni Muslims.

42 Al-Mahaasin an-Nafsaaniyah pg.166

43 Tafseer al-Burhan for Hashim al-Bahrani 2/300

It is mentioned in the book *Wasaa'il ash-She'at* that al-Fudail b. Yasar said: 'I asked Abu Ja'far about a *Shi'ite* woman and whether I should marry her to a *Nasibi*? He said: 'No, for the *Naasibi* is a *Kaafir* (non-believer).'⁴⁴

The *Naasibi* is one who hates Ali b. Abi Talib. The *Shi'ites* call the Sunni Muslims *Nawasib*, because the Sunni Muslims state that Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman were rightful caliphs before Ali, may Allah be pleased with him. In any case this was affirmed during the Messenger of Allah's time. The proof for this is in the *Hadith* of Ibn Umar: '*We were comparing people during the Messenger of Allah's time, and we would choose Abu Bakr, then Umar then Uthman.*' (*Bukhari*)

At-Tabrani added in *al-Kabir*: 'The Prophet would know that we did this, and he would not reject to what we did.'

Ibn Asaakir said: 'We used to favor Abu Bakr then Umar, then Uthman and then Ali.'

It is narrated in the *Musnad* that Ali b. Abi Talib said: 'The best of people in the Ummah after the Prophet of Allah are Abu Bakr and Umar, and if you wish I will tell you the third.' Imam adh-Dhahabi said that this narration was *Mutawaatir* (i.e. unanimously narrated).



44 *Wasaa'il ash-She'at* for al-Hurr al-Aamili 7/431 and at-Tahdeeb 7/303.

WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAAFIDHAH IN RELATION TO MUT'AH AND WHAT IS ITS VIRTUE?

Mut'ah has a great virtue with the *Raafidhah*, we seek refuge with Allah! It is mentioned in the book '*Manhaj as-Sadiqeen*' for Fathullaah al-Kaashani that as-Sadiq said: '*Mut'ah* is my religion and the religion of my forefathers. Whoever does it, applies our Deen and whoever rejects it, indeed rejects our Deen; nay, rather he adheres to a Deen other than ours! The child that is born from the *Mut'ah* relation is better than a child that is born in wedlock, and the one who disbelieves in it is an apostate, a clear non-believer.'⁴⁵

Al-Qummi stated in his book '*Man laa yahdoro al-Faqeeh*' that Abdullah b. Se'naan reported that Abu Abdullah said: 'Allah, the Exalted, has prohibited intoxicants for our *Shi'ites* and has given them *Mut'ah* instead.'⁴⁶

It is mentioned in *Tafseer Minhaaj as-Sadiqeen* for Mul'lah Fathul-laah al-Kaashani that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: 'Whoever does *Mut'ah* once will free a third of himself from Hell. Whoever does it twice will free 2/3rds of himself from Hell and whoever does it three times will free himself completely from Hell.' In the same source it is mentioned that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: 'Whoever does *Mut'ah* once will protect themselves from the anger of Allah, whoever does it twice will be raised with the pious and whoever does it three times will be with me in Jannah.'

45 *Manhaj as-Sadiqeen* for Mul'lah Fathul-laah al-Kaashani pg.2/495

46 *Man laa Yahdoro al-Faqeeh* for Ibn Babyaih al-Qummi pg.330

In the same source it is mentioned that the Prophet (ﷺ) said: 'Whoever does *Mut'ah* once will be of the level of al-Husain, and whoever does it twice will be of the level of al-Hasan and whoever does it three times will be of the level of Ali b. Abi Talib and whoever does it four times will be of my level.'⁴⁷ The *Raafidhah* do not set a limit to the maximum number of women one can be with through *Mut'ah*. It is mentioned in '*Furoo al-Kaafi*' and '*At-Tahdeeb*' and '*Al-Istibsaar*' that Zurarah b. Abu Abdullah said: 'Is a person allowed only four women through *Mut'ah*?' He said: 'Marry if you wish a thousand for they are paid.' Muhammad b. Muslim reported that Abu Ja'far said in relation to *al-Mut'ah*: 'It is not only from four, for they are not divorced nor do they inherit; rather, she is paid.' How can this be when Allah says:

"And they who guard their private parts. Except from their wives or those their right hands possess, for indeed, they will not be blamed-But whoever seeks beyond that, then those are the transgressors"} (Qur'an 23:5-7)

From this verse it is clear that we are only allowed to marry woman through wedlock and if she is acquired as a spoil of war. Anything else is unlawful. The woman who is taken through *Mut'ah* is 'paid'; thus, she is not a wife, she is not inherited, and is not divorced. In other words, she is a fornicator. Sheikh Abdullah b. Jibreen, may Allah preserve him, said: 'The *Raafidhah* use as proof to legalize *Mut'ah* the verse in Surah an-Nisaa, the meaning of which is:

"And [also prohibited to you are all] married women except those your right hands possess."⁴⁸ [This is] the decree of Allah

47 Tafseer Manhaj as-Sadiqeen for Mullah Fathul-laah al-Kaashani 2/492-3

48 i.e. slaves or war captives who had polytheist husbands.

upon you. And lawful to you are [all others] beyond these, [provided] that you seek them [in marriage] with [gifts from] your property, desiring chastity, not unlawful sexual intercourse. So for whatever you enjoy [of marriage] from them, give them their due compensation⁴⁹ as an obligation. And there is no blame upon you for what you mutually agree to beyond the obligation. Indeed, Allah is ever Knowing and Wise"} (Qur'an 4:24)

The answer to this is that the verses all talk about marriage from the words of Allah:

- ❑ {"It is not lawful for you to inherit women by compulsion"} (Qur'an 4:19)
- ❑ {"But if you want to replace one wife with another"} (Qur'an 4:20)
- ❑ {"And do not marry those [women] whom your fathers married"} (Qur'an 4:22)
- ❑ {"Prohibited to you [for marriage] are your mothers"} (Qur'an 4:23)

After Allah talks about the women who are prohibited through lineage and specific reasons he said:

"And lawful to you are [all others] beyond these"} (Qur'an 4:24)

This means all other women are lawful to you, if you marry them and give them their rightful dowries which you have set for them, but if they leave some of it aside out of their good nature

49 The mahr, a specified gift to the bride required of the man upon marriage.

there is no sin on you. This is how the verse was interpreted by the majority of the Companions and those who came after them.

The *Shi'ite* of the Tusi sect despised *Mut'ah* in his book '*Tahdheeb al-Ahkaam*', he said: 'If the woman is from a noble family it is not lawful for her to indulge in this activity due to the shame and disgrace that will befall her family.'⁵⁰

The *Shi'ites* also legalized anal sex. It is mentioned in *al-Istibsaar* that Ali b. al-Hakam said: 'I heard Sufyan saying, 'I heard ar-Rida saying: 'One of your followers asked me to ask you something because he himself was ashamed to ask you directly.' He said what is it? He said: 'Is it lawful for a man to approach his wife in her anus?' He said: 'Yes it is lawful!'



**WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE RAAFIDHAH
IN RELATION TO AN-NAJAF AND KARBALA?
WHAT IS THE MERIT OF VISITING THESE
PLACES ACCORDING TO THEM?**

The *Shi'ites* considered the actual or supposed graves of their Imams as holy sites. According to them Kufa, Karbala and Qumm are sacred cities. They narrate a report on the authority of as-Sadiq that Allah has a Haram which is Makkah, and the Prophet (ﷺ) has a Haram which is Madinah and the Leader of the Believers

⁵⁰ Tahdheeb al-Ahkaam for at-Tusi 7/227

has a Haram which is Kufa and we (i.e. the *Shi'ites*) have a Haram which is Qumm.

According to the *Shi'ites*, Karbala is greater in virtue than the Ka'bah itself. It is mentioned in *Bihaar al-Anwaar* that Abu Abdullah said: 'Allah revealed to the Ka'bah: 'Had it not been for the soil of Karbala, I would not have favored you, had it not been for the people who reside there I would not have created you nor would I have created the House that I am proud of, so be a humble servant to the land of Karbala, otherwise I will cast you into Hell.'⁵¹

According to the *Shi'ites* visiting the grave of al-Husain in Karbala is greater than performing the fifth pillar of Islam which is the pilgrimage to Makkah. Al-Majlisi mentions in his book *Bihaar al-Anwaar* that Bashir ad-Dah'han said: 'I said to Abu Abdullah: 'Sometimes I forget to perform Hajj but I realize the greatness of the grave of al-Husain.' He said: 'Good work, any believer who visits the grave of al-Husain knowing its virtue, it will be recorded for him as 20 Hajj and 20 Umrah which are all accepted. It will also be recorded for him as 20 battles fought under a Messenger or a just ruler. Whoever goes to it on the Day of Arafah, knowing its virtue it will be recorded for him as 1000 Hajj and 1000 Umrah all of which are accepted and a 1000 battles fought with a Messenger or a just Imam.'

In the same source it is mentioned that those who come to visit al-Husain are pure, and those who perform Hajj and stand on Arafah are children of Fornication! *A'udhubillah!!* It is mentioned that Ali b. Asbaat mentions that Abu Abdullah said: 'Allah begins viewing those who come to visit the grave of al-Husain on the eve of Arafah.' I said to him, is this before He looks at the people of

51 Tafseer Manhaj as-Sadiqeen for Mul'lah Fathul-laah al-Kaashani 2/492-3

Arafah? He said yes! I asked why and he said: 'Among the people who stand on Arafah are children of fornication and this is not the case for those who visit the grave of al-Husain.'⁵²

Their scholar Ali as-Sistaani said in his book: '*Manhaj as-Saliheen*' it is better to perform prayers near graves and holy sites than to perform them in the Masjid.' He said: '**Issue number 562:** 'It is praiseworthy to perform prayers in sacred places belonging to the Imams. It is even stated that it is better than performing prayers in the Masjids. It is mentioned that performing prayers near Ali b. Abi Talib is greater than 200 000 thousands prayers elsewhere.'⁵³

Abbas al-Kaashani, a radical *Shi'ite* cleric, even stated in his book: "*Masabeeh al-Jinaan*": 'It is without doubt that the land of Karbala is the holiest site in Islam. It has been favored in the textual proofs over all other lands. It is the blessed land of Allah. It is the humble, submissive land of Allah. It is the chosen land of Allah. It is the safe and sacred sanctuary of Allah. It is the dome of Islam. It is one of the places Allah loves His slaves to worship Him in. Its soil is a cure for all diseases. These virtues are not even recorded for the Ka'bah.'⁵⁴

In the book *al-Mazaar* by Muhammad an-Nu'man, who is called ash-Sheikh al-Mofeed, said about the Masjid in al-Kufa: 'It is narrated that Abu Ja'far al-Baqir said: 'Were people to know the virtue of the Masjid of Kufa, they would have prepared for it provisions and would come to it from every corner of the world. Performing a prayer there is equal to one Hajj, and performing a

52 Ibid 85/98

53 *Manhaj as-Saliheen* for as-Sistaani 1/187

54 *Masabeeh al-Jinaan* for Abbas al-Kashaani pg.360

Nafl prayer is equal to performing Umrah.⁵⁵ In the same book it states that the visitor of the grave should point with his right hand and should say: 'I am coming to you as a visitor I seek firmness in coming to you, I am convinced that Allah will alleviate hardship through you and through you, He will send down mercy. I ask Allah through you, my Master, to take care of my debts and my needs and to seek forgiveness for me.'⁵⁶

Dear reader, look at how these people commit polytheism by asking other than Allah to take care of their needs. Look at how they seek forgiveness from their sins from other than Allah, how can this be possible when Allah says:

{ "No one forgives the sins except Allah" } (Qur'an 2:135)

We seek refuge with Allah from committing Shirk.



WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUNNI MUSLIMS AND SHI'ITES

Nidhaam ad-Deen Muhammad al-Adhami said in his book, entitled: *'The Shi'ites and Mut'ah'*: 'The difference between us and them is not a simple jurisprudential difference, such as the issue of

55 Al-Mazar for ash-Sheikh al-Mofeed pg.20

56 Ibid pg.99

Mut'ah. It is a difference of fundamentals and tenets of faith. The difference in faith can be clearly seen through the following points:

1 The *Raafidhah* claim that the Qur'an is distorted and no longer remains in its pristine form. We say that the Qur'an is complete and remains in its pristine form. No change will happen to it nor will it be distorted till the end of time. Allah says:

{ "Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e. the Qur'an] and indeed, We will be its guardian" } (Qur'an 15:9)

2 The *Raafidhah* claim that all the Companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) apostatized after the death of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) save a few. They believe that they were unfaithful to the Message of Allah and did not pass it on as they should have; especially the Caliphs, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. The *Shi'ites* claim that their disbelief is greater than any of the other Companion's disbelief.

We say that the Companions of the Messenger of Allah are the best of creation after the Prophets and Messengers. We believe that they are all trustworthy, and do not forge lies against the Prophet (ﷺ). They were trustworthy in conveying the Message of Islam to us.

3 The *Raafidhah* claim that their 12 Imams are infallible. They claim that they knew the unseen and have knowledge of all that was taught to the Angels and Prophets and Messengers. They claim that they know the knowledge of the unseen and what will happen in the future. Nothing is hidden from them. They claim they know every language in the world and that the earth belongs to them.

We say that the 12 Imams are like any other ordinary human being; among them are the scholars and jurists. We do not ascribe to them what they did not ascribe to themselves.⁵⁷



WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE SHI'ITES IN RELATION TO AASHOORA AND WHAT IS ITS MERIT ACCORDING TO THEM?

The *Raafidhah* set up festivities, parties and hold demonstrations in the streets and open areas. They wear black clothes as a sign of their grief on the 'anniversary' of the death of al-Husain. It is held during the first ten days of Muharram every year. They believe it to be among the greatest of things that will bring them nearer to Allah. They slap their faces, chests and backs. They scream out and women tear their clothes. People scream 'O Husain, O Husain!' This can be witnessed especially on the tenth of Muharram. They beat themselves with chains and swords as is the case in Iran and other countries.

Their scholars encourage them to do these actions, which makes them a laughing stock. One of their scholars, Muhammad Hasan Aal Kaashif al-Ghata, was asked about what his fellow members of faith were doing, and what they hoped to achieve through beating themselves and he said: 'This is a sign of aggrandizing the limits and boundaries of Allah.' He then quoted the words of Allah:

57 Introduction of Nidham ad-Deen Muhammad al-Adthami for the book *'Ash-Sheat wal-Mutah*.

{*"That [is so]. And whoever honors the symbols [i.e. rites] of Allah-indeed, it is from the piety of hearts"*} (*Qur'an* 22:32)



WHAT IS THE BELIEF OF THE SHI'ITES IN RELATION TO THE BAI'AT (PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE)?

The *Raafidhah* consider every government other than the 12 Imamate government a false one. It is mentioned in *al-Kafi* and *al-Ghaibah* by an-Nu'mani that Abu Ja'far said: 'Every state that is established before the appearance of al-Qaim, al-Mahdi, its leader is a Taghoot (transgressors who usurp the divine right of government).'⁵⁸

According to them, it is not lawful for one to obey a ruler that is not sanctioned by the command of Allah except in an apparent way, through *Tuqyah*. They describe Sunni rulers as oppressors and being not fit to rule. This is what they say about the Caliphs of Islam, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, may Allah be pleased with them all.

The Raafidhi al-Majlisi, one of the *Shi'ite* deviants and compiler of *Bihaar al-Anwaar*, said about the Rightly Guided Caliphs: 'They were rulers who forcefully took power, they were apostates, may Allah curse them and those who wronged the *Ahlul-Bait* (family of

58 *Al-Kafi* with its explanation by Al-Mazandarani 12/371 and al-Bihar 25/113

the Prophet, may Allah praise him).⁵⁹ This is what their Imam al-Majlisi says. His book is considered an important source of *Hadith*.

Based on their belief in relation to the Caliphs, they considered anyone who cooperated with them a *Taghoot* and an oppressor. Al-Kulaini narrated that Umar b. Handhalah said: 'I asked Abu Abdullah about two men from our companions who argue about a debt or inheritance rate, and then seek a judgment from the ruler or justice system, what they should do and whether this was legal? He said: "Whoever seeks their rule either in truth or falsehood, indeed is taking the unlawful, even if it is his right because he has taken it through a *Taghoot*."⁶⁰

Al-Khomeini said in his book, *Al-Hukoomatul-Islamiyah*: "The Imam himself should prevent a person from going to seek justice through the rulers and their judges. Going to them is like going to a *Taghoot*."⁶¹ In the ninth chapter of the book '*At-Tuqyah fee Fiqh Ahlil-Bait*' where it is mentioned about *Tuqyah* in relation to Jihad, there is a confirmation of the research completed by Ayatullaah Al-Haaj ash-Sheikh Muslim ad-Da'wori in which he talked about working for an oppressive ruler. What is meant by 'oppressive ruler' is the Sunni ruler. He said: 'Working for the ruler is of three levels. At times one will work for the ruler to make the lives of the believers (i.e. the *Shi'ites*) easy and to take care of their needs. The ruling of this category is that it is praiseworthy. At times one will work for them with the intention of finding a means to sustain himself; the ruling of this category is that it is lawful but should be avoided. If he works to make the lives of his fellow believers easy, this will

59 *Bihaar al-Anwaar* for al-Majlisi 4/385

60 *Al-Kafi* for al-Kulaini 1/67, *At-Tahdheeb* 6/301, *Man laa Yahdoro al-Faqeeh* 3/5.

61 *Al-Hukoomatul-Islamiyah* pg.74.

compensate for him. At other times one will work for them because he finds no other source of sustenance and he wants to get the basic needs of life, the ruling of this category is that it is lawful.'⁶²

Dear brother look at how they view the Sunni Muslims as being people of oppression! Look at how they legalized working for a Sunni Muslim with a number of conditions, the most important of which is to be able to benefit the general assembly of *Shi'ites*, so that that work could be considered lawful! The *Shi'ites* have a strong allegiance to *Shi'ites* governments. They do not work anywhere but try their best to bring in their fellow *Shi'ites* into power and try to distance Sunni Muslims.



WHAT IS THE RULING OF OVERLOOKING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SUNNI MUSLIMS AND POLYTHEIST RAAFIDHAH?

I will relate here an article written by Naasir al-Qifari in his book: '*Mas'alat at-Taqreeb*', he, may Allah preserve him, said:

How can we come to terms with those who defame the Qur'an, interpret it in an inappropriate way and claim that divine revelation was given to their Imams after the Qur'an!

62 At-Tuqyah fee Fiqh ahli'l-Bait for Ayatul-laah al-Haaj ash-Sheikh Muslim adDa'wori

How can we come to terms with those who view the Imamate as a form of prophethood, and their Imams as being better than the Prophets?

How can we come to terms with those who interpret worshipping Allah alone, which was the message of all Prophets and Messengers, with a false meaning...they claim that obedience is to obey the Imams and that Shirk is to obey other than them!

How can we come to terms with those who impute disbelief to the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, and claim that they are all non-believers except three, four or seven, depending on their different narrations. They differ from the general assembly of Muslims in relation to beliefs such as Imamate, infallibility, *Tuqyah* and they claim the belief of *ar-Raj'ah*, *Al-Ghaibat* and *al-Bada'*!



WHAT HAVE THE PIOUS PREDECESSORS SAID ABOUT THE RAAFDIHAH?

Sheikh Islam b. Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said: 'The scholars have unanimously agreed that the *Raafidhah* are the most dishonest and untruthful of all sects. The quality of dishonesty is noted amongst them from their very beginnings, that is why scholars have noted them to be liars.' Ash'hab b. Abdul-Aziz said: 'I asked Imam Malik, may Allah have mercy on him, about the

Raafidhah and he said: "Do not speak to them nor narrate anything from them, for they are dishonest."

Imam Malik, may Allah have mercy on him, said: 'The one who curses the Companions of the Messenger of Allah has no share in Islam.'

Ibn Kathir said at the exegesis of the verse:

"Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e. sign] is on their faces [i.e. foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers so that He [i.e. Allah] may enrage by them⁶³ the disbelievers. Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward"} (Qur'an 48:29)

...from this verse Imam Malik, may Allah have mercy on him, established the disbelief of the *Raafidhah* who despise the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ). He said: "They hate them, and whoever hates a companion is a *Kaafir* (non-believer) as per this verse."

Imam al-Qurtubi said: 'Imam Malik was right in his statement and was correct in his exegesis of this verse. Whoever ridicules or attacks the narration of a Companion will have disregarded the *Shari'ah* of Allah.'

63 The given examples depict the Prophet (ﷺ) and his companions.

Abu Hatim said: 'Harmalah said: "I heard Imam ashShaf'ee, may Allah have mercy on him, saying: "I have not witnessed anyone more accepting of falsehood than the *Raafidhah*."

Mu'mal b. Ahaab said: 'I heard Yazid b. Haroon saying: "Write the narrations of every man of *Bid'ah* who is not openly professing it or calling others to it except the *Raafidhah*, for they are liars."

Muhammad b. Sa'id al-Asbahani said: 'I heard Shuraik saying: "I take the knowledge from everyone that I meet except from the *Raafidhah*, for they fabricate narrations and see it a religious duty to do this." Shuraik b. Abdullah was the Judge of Kufa.

Mu'awiyah said: 'I heard al-A'mush saying: "I have met many people, all of whom call them liars." He meant the companions of al-Mughirah b. Sa'eed ar-Rafidhi, who was described by Imam adh-Dhahabi as a liar.

Sheikh Islam b. Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said: 'As for the *Raafidhah*, the origin of their deviation stems from disbelief, infidelity, and lying. They themselves state this by saying: "Our Deen is *Tuqyah*" *Tuqyah* refers to concealing in the heart other than that which you tell people. This is lying and hypocrisy as well.'

Abdullah b. Ahmed b. Hanbal said: 'I asked my father about the *Raafidhah*, and he said: "The ones who swear or curse at Abu Bakr and Umar? Ask Allah to have mercy on them and distance yourself from those who despise them."

Al-Khal'laal narrated that Abu Bakr al-Marwazi said: 'I asked Abu Abdullah about those who swear at Abu Bakr, Umar and A'ishah (ﷺ) and he said: "I don't see such a person being a Muslim."

Al-Khal'laal said: 'Harb b. Ismail al-Kirmaani informed him that Musa b. Harun b. Ziyad said I heard Al-Firyabi being asked about one who swore at Abu Bakr, and he responded that he was *Kaafir*, and he was asked whether or not one should perform *Jinazah* prayer for that individual and he answered 'no.'

When Imam Ibn Hazm, may Allah have mercy on him, was debating with the Christians and they had brought the books of the *Raafidhah* to refute him, he said: 'The *Raafidhah* are not Muslims, their statements cannot be held against the Deen. This is a sect that came about after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ) by about 25 years. It is a sect that is similar to the Jews and Christians in terms of disbelief and dishonesty.'

Abu Zur'ah ar-Razi said: 'If you see a man defaming one of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, know that he is a disbeliever.'

The Permanent Committee in Saudi Arabia was asked a question. The questioner and a group of people were living near a group who adhered to the *Ja'fari (Shi'ite) Madth'hab*. Some Sunni Muslims refused to eat from their slaughtered animals and others ate from them. Is it lawful for a Sunni to eat from them, while it is known that they call upon Ali, al-Hasan and al-Husain during times of ease and hardship?

The Permanent Committee comprised of Sheikh Abdul-Aziz b. Baz, Sheikh Abdur-Razaq al-Afifi, Sheikh Abdullah b. Ghudayan and Sheikh Abdullah b. Qa'ood, may Allah reward them all, answered:

All praise be to Allah, and may Allah praise the Prophet and render him safe from ever derogatory thing. If the issue is as is

mentioned by the questioner, that there are people who adhere to the *Ja'fari Madth'hab*, and they call upon Ali, al-Hasan and al-Husain, then they are polytheists, who have apostatized from Islam. We seek refuge with Allah from that. It is not lawful to eat of their slaughtered animals for it is considered '*Maitah*' i.e. an unlawful animal. Even if the name of Allah is mentioned before it was slaughtered.'

The scholar Abdullah b. Abdurrahmann b. al-Jibreen, may Allah preserve him, was asked a question in which it states: 'We have a *Raafidhi* who works as a butcher. Sunni Muslims bring their animals for him to slaughter. There are a few restaurants that do business with him. What is the ruling of doing business with this *Raafidhi*? What is the ruling of their slaughtered animals?'

Wa'alaikum as salam wa rahmatul'laahi wa barakatuh. The animal slaughtered by the *Raafidhi* is not lawful for us, nor is it lawful to consume. The majority of the *Raafidhah* are polytheists, for they call upon Ali in times of need, even during Arafah, the Tawaf and Sa'ee. They call unto his children and their Imams, as we have heard on numerous occasions. This is a form of greater Shirk. It is also apostasy which one should be killed over. They adulate Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, and attribute to him traits that belong to Allah alone, as we have heard them doing so in Arafah. With this they are apostates for they made Ali a God and a Creator, who has power over the affairs of the universe, and knows the unseen and has the power to harm and extend benefit.

They also desecrate the Qur'an, and claim that the Companions of the Messenger of Allah distorted it and omitted from it certain things that relate to the family of the Messenger of Allah. They do not adhere to its text nor use it as a proof. They defame the great

Companions of the Messenger of Allah, especially the three, Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman, and the mothers of the believers and the famous Companions the likes of Anas, Jabir and Abu Hurairah. They do not accept their *Hadith* for they claim them to be non-Muslims. They do not adhere to the *hadith* mentioned in Saheeh Bukhari and Muslim, except for those narrations that are on the authority of *Ahlul-Bait*. They use falsified proofs and at times bring no evidence for what they say. They are hypocritical and say contrary to what they conceal in their hearts. They say: 'He who does not have *Tuqyah* has no Deen.'

We do not accept their claims that they love us, or that they are our brothers, for hypocrisy is the creed they hold to.



SURAT AL-WILAYAH

This is the translation of the chapter of the Qur'an the *Shi'ites* claim was removed by Sunni Muslims from the Qur'an:

O you who believe, believe in the two lights that We have sent down that recite to you My verses and warn you from the torment of a Great Day. Two lights from each other and I am the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing. Those who are faithful to the verses and His Messenger indeed have Gardens filled with bounty. Those who disbelieve after having believed by disregarding the covenant that was given to them by the

Messenger will be tossed into Hell. They wronged themselves and disobeyed the 'Wasi' (regent, i.e. Ali) and they will be given to drink from *Hameem* (a river in Hell). Indeed it is Allah who has lightened the heavens and earth with what He willed and chose from the Angels and made the believers of His creation, Allah does what He wills, there is no God but Him, He is the All-Merciful, the especially Merciful.

Those in the past planned evil plans for their Messengers, so Allah destroyed them on account of their planning. And I punish severely. Indeed Allah destroyed the people of *Aad* and *Thamood* on account of what they did and has made them for you a clear sign, don't you have fear? Fir'awn was punished for what he did towards Musa and his brother Haroon, I drowned him and those who followed him, so that this would serve for you as a sign, but the majority of you are sinners. Allah will gather them on the Day of Resurrection and they will not be able to answer when they are questioned. Hell is their abode and indeed Allah is all-Knowing and all-Wise. O Messenger convey my warning to them for they will come to know. Those who went away from my signs and rule will be among the losers. Those who are sincere to the covenant will be rewarded with Gardens of Bliss. Indeed Allah is all-Forgiving and has a great reward.

Indeed Ali is among the pious. We will give him his full compensation on the Day of Resurrection. We are not going to wrong him in the least. We have honored him above all of your family. Indeed he and his family are patient. Indeed his enemy is the chief of the criminals. Say to those who disbelieve after they have believed, "you have sought the beauty of this world, and rushed to attain it, and you forget Allah's covenant upon you, and you broke the firm promises and we have struck many examples for you so that you heed.

O Messenger We have sent down to you many clear verses which state that those who die as believers that they will be successful. Leave the disbelievers aside, we will gather them on a Day in which nothing will benefit them nor will they be shown mercy. They will be cast into Hell. So praise the name of your *Rabb* and be of those who prostrate. We have sent Musa and Haroon, but they wanted Haroon. So hold patiently, and we made from among them (i.e. the Jews) monkeys and swine and we cursed them till the Day of Resurrection. Have patience and they will come to their senses. We have through you established the system of justice, just as We did through previous Messengers. We made from them a '*Wasi*' so that they would return.

Whoever forsakes My command, indeed they will return to Me. Let them enjoy their disbelief for a short time, and do not ask about those who break the covenant. O Messenger We have made for you on the throats of those who believed a covenant, so take by it and be from the thankful.

Indeed Ali performs prayers by the night and is fearful of the Hereafter, and he hopes for the reward of His Rubb. Say, are those who wrong themselves equal while they know of My punishment? We will put on their throats chains and they will be sorry for what they have done. We have given you the glad-tidings of his good progeny. They have from Me reward. And to those who have taken the path of the righteous, will have from Me mercy and they will reside in Heaven safely, and all praise is due to Allah, the *Rabb* of the Worlds.



THE ALLEGED TABLET OF FATIMAH

This is a Book from Allah, the all-Powerful, the All-Wise to Muhammad, His Prophet, His light, His Ambassador and His living evidence to mankind. Jibreel brought it down from the Rabb of the Worlds. O Muhammad exalt My mention and be grateful for the bounties that I have bestowed upon you. Do not be ungrateful regarding My signs. Indeed I am Allah, there is no God but I, the destroyer of the arrogant and helper of the oppressed. I am Indeed the Only God, there is no God but I. Whoever hopes for other than My reward or fears other than I, I will punish him in a way like I have punished no other. So worship Me and depend upon Me. I have not sent a Prophet except that I have assigned for him a '*Wasi*' (i.e. regent). I have favored you over all the Prophets and have favored your *Wasi* over all other *Wasi*. I have honored you with al-Hasan and al-Husain. I made al-Hasan the keeper of the knowledge after his father. I then blessed Husain with martyrdom. He is the best martyr who has the highest rank. I made My words complete with him. My clear evidence is with him. On account of his family I shall decide who is to be punished or rewarded. The first of them is Ali, the best of all worshippers. His son is like his grandfather. The praised Muhammad al-Baqir has My knowledge. Those who doubt Ja'far will be destroyed. Those who reject him are similar to those who reject Me. It is indeed an affirmed ruling from me that I will honor Jafar. After him will come Musa. My Awliya will be given the complete reward; whoever rejects one of them will indeed have rejected My bounty.

Whoever changes a verse in My book will have forged a lie against Me. Woe to the liar who forged lies against Me. After the

end of the period of Musa, my slave, the one whom I love, (...) He will be killed by an arrogant devil. He will be buried in the city that is built by the pious slave next to the most evil of creation. It is a set judgment from Me that his son Muhammad will come after him, and he will be his caliph after him. No one believes in him except that I have made Jannah his final abode. I will allow him to then intercede on behalf of seventy of his family members who were all doomed to Hell. I will grant happiness to Ali, my Wali and my supporter. He is my witness over the creation and the trustworthy over the *Wahi* (revelation).

After him the *Da'ee* (caller) to my path and the keeper of the knowledge al-Hasan will come, and it will be completed with his son (...) who is a mercy to mankind. He will have the perfection of Musa, the beauty of Jesus, and the patience of Ayoub. People will submit themselves to him, as will the heads of the Turks and ad-Dailam. They will be killed, burnt, and they will be full of fear and be scared. The earth will be painted with their blood. Their women will be full of fear and will be punished. Those are my *Awliya* in truth. Through them will the Fitnah of *Amya Handas* be stopped. Through them will the earthquakes become apparent, and the hardships will be dropped. Upon them is the mercy of God and they are the rightly guided.

Abdurrahmann b. Salim said that Abu Basir said: 'If this is the only *Hadith* you heard in your life, it would suffice you.'



**DU'AA SANAMAI QURAISH
(I.E. THE TWO IDOLS OF QURAISH)
WHAT IS MEANT IS ABU BAKR AND UMAR**

I begin with the name of Allah, the most merciful, the especially merciful. O Allah praise Muhammad and the family of Muhammad.

O Allah curse the 'two idols' of Quraish and their two superstitious objects and their two *Taghoot* (false objects of worship).

O Allah curse the two involved in the Ifk, and curse their two daughters, who disobeyed your command, and rejected your *Wahi* (revelation) and rejected Your bounties, and disobeyed Your Messenger, and changed Your religion, and distorted Your scripture, and loved Your enemy, and discarded Your rulings, and cast aside Your duties, and disregarded Your signs, and have proclaimed enmity against You Wali and took the side of your enemy and destroyed Your lands, and spread evil among Your slaves.

O Allah curse them and their followers, and supporters and parties, those who show affection towards them; for they have ruined the house of Prophethood, and sealed off its doors, and broke its ceiling and have then made its heaven like its earth, and destroyed its family and killed off its helpers, and its children and left its minbar empty from its rightful holder and heir. They disregarded his Imamate and committed Shirk with the Rabb. Their sin has been magnified, and they will be forever dwelling in *Saqar* (hell). How devastating is Saqar, it will leave no person?

O Allah curse them by the number of people who approached them, and for every right they have disregarded, and every Minbar they have climbed atop, and for every believer they have given hope, and hypocrite that has sided with them, and for every *Wali* they have harmed, and for every person they have chased away, and for every truthful person they have kicked away and unbeliever they have supported and Imam they have overcome, and every *Fard* (obligatory duty) they have changed, and for every narration they have rejected, and evil they have favored, and every blood they have shed, and every goodness they have changed, and every disbelief they have set up, and for every lie they have masked, and every inheritance they have wrongfully acquired, and for every spoil of war they have taken wrongfully, and every unlawful they consumed, and every *khums* they have legalized and every evil they have established, and every wrongdoing they have spread, and every hypocrisy they have kept hidden, and every treachery they have kept secret, and every transgression they have spread, and every promise they have broken, and every trust they were treacherous in, and for every Halal they have proclaimed as Haram, and every Haram they have legalized, and every stomach they have ripped open, and every unborn child in the womb of their mothers they have killed, and for every pious they have made ignoble, and for every ignoble they have made a pious, and for every right they have prevented from reaching its rightful people, and every lie they have spread.

O Allah curse them by the number of verses they have distorted, and compulsory duties they have cast aside, and for every *Sunnah* they have changed, and charges they have levied from the people without right and every commandment they have changed, and things they have forsaken, and the pledge of allegiance which they did not uphold, and testimonials they hid, and Da'wah they

have discredited, and evidences they have denied, and tricks and treachery they have brought about.

O Allah curse them in the tablet, and in the open many curses, forever and ever, curse them an infinite number of times. Curse them many times with no end. Curse them and their helpers, and supporters, lovers and slaves.

(Say four times) O Allah curse them so much so that the people of Hell will seek refuge from their punishment. Ameen O Rabb of the Worlds.

(Then say four times) O Allah curse them all, O Allah praise the Prophet and the family of the Prophet and enrich me with the halal so that I need not the Haram and I seek refuge with You from poverty. O Allah I have wronged myself and have recognized my sins and I now stand in front of you, do what you want with me so that you are pleased with Me. I will not return to sinning, but if I do return forgive me, and You indeed forgive through Your virtue, kindness and forgiveness, O Merciful.

May Allah praise the Last of all Prophets, his pure family, O Merciful!



CONCLUSION

Dear Muslim, you may now agree with me that whoever believes in these false beliefs is not of the Muslims, even if they call themselves 'Muslims'. Dear brother what is your duty towards the Raafidhah, now that they live amongst the Muslims?

You should be careful, and should not engage in transactions with them. You should warn people about their dangerous beliefs which are based on enmity towards every person who believes in Allah, and Islam as their Deen and Muhammad, may Allah praise him, as their Prophet and Messenger.

Sheikh Islam b. Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, said: 'As for the Raafidhi, they will not live amongst any people except that they will resort to using *Nifaq* (hypocrisy). The Deen that they hold in his heart is a false Deen, it compels them to lie, be treacherous, and to trick people and to want evil for them. They will not leave aside an evil which they can do but will do it towards a Sunni Muslim. If a person does not know they are *Raafidhah*, they will be able to tell that they are due to the hypocrisy that will become apparent to any individual, as well one can tell this from their speech.'

They hold hatred, animosity and enmity towards us. May Allah finish them off. With all of this, we will still find people who are confused from amongst the general assembly of the Muslims, who deal with them on a daily basis. They may even trust them, all of this is based on the fact that they are not applying their Deen and do not know the teachings of Islam which order a Muslim to deal

with people on account of Wala and al-Bara which is to love and hate for the sake of Allah. We are to proclaim our innocence from every non-believer and polytheist.

With this we can see the duty that lies upon us as Muslims, so is there anyone who will heed this?

We ask Allah to grant victory to His Deen, and to make supreme his words, and to defeat the *Raaqidhah* and those who support them. May Allah praise the Prophet and render him, and his family and Companions safe from every evil.

Was salaam alaikum wa rahmatullaah wa barakatuh.



INTRODUCTION

All praises are due to Allah, Who says:

*{ "And, this is My path, which is straight, so follow it; and do not follow (other) ways, for you will be separated from His way" }
(Al-An'am: 153).*

May Allah's blessings and peace be upon His Messenger and last Prophet, who says: "The Children of Israel were divided into seventy-one denominations, and my nation will be divided into seventy-three denominations, all of which are in hell except one". He was asked: 'O, Messenger of Allah, which is this one?' He said: (It is) the one which I and my companions follow today".

It has been Allah's determined will that the Muslims will be divided into diverse sects, denominations and parties, each party bearing enmity towards the other, and conspiring against one another, going against the clear commandment with which Allah ordered them whenever they differ with one another, that is to refer their disagreements and conflicts to the Book of Allah and the *Sunnah* of His Prophet (ﷺ). Allah says:

{ "And if you disagree over anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger, if you believe in Allah and the Last Day. That is the best [way] and best in result" } (An-Nisaa: 59).

As such it is necessary upon whoever wishes well for his nation, and who aspires for the unity of the Ummah, to strive to the best of his ability in bringing its various sects into one nation 'on pure

truth and the right path', and making them revert to their old days in the days of the Messenger sallallahu alaihi wa alihi wa sallam, in all aspects of the deen: theologically, legally and morally, in line with Allah's commandment:

{ "And hold firmly to the rope of Allah all together and do not become divided" } (Ali-'Imran: 103).

One of the most important purposes that stimulate one to be eager in this direction is the need to enlighten the followers of those sects that deviated from the teachings of the Qur'an and *Sunnah* about the deviations they follow, which prevented them from finding guidance and from being with the mainstream Islamic community.

This is the intent behind collecting and compiling these most obliging questions, posed at the youths of the Twelver *Shi'ites*, in the hope that they will contribute in bringing the intellectual among them back to the truth when they ponder upon these pressing questions that cannot be easily avoided but by adhering to the true cause of the Qur'an and the *Sunnah* which are surely free from these sorts of contradictions.

I was really impressed by the action of a *Shi'ite* brother who was guided to the truth when he wrote a book in which he relates his experience of the journey from falsehood to guidance, and he gave the book a befitting name he called: "I Won the *Sahabah* Without Losing the *Ahl Al-Bait*".

This title is quite in place, because a true Muslim never finds within himself any discomfort in combining the love for *Ahl Al-Bait* with the love for the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ), may Allah be pleased with all of them.

This reminds me of a Christian who reverted to Islam and wrote a book which he called: "I Won Muhammad Without Losing Jesus".

May Allah make the book useful to those of them whom Allah wishes to guide, and make it a starting point for anything good, by reminding them that reverting to the truth is always better than blindly remaining on falsehood, and that one of them – at the time he adheres to the *Sunnah* and feels at ease with it and helps its cause – can be better in reward and position than thousands of *Ahl as-Sunnah* who are heedless of the teachings of their religion, who indulge wholly in satisfying their whims and caprices or have fallen prey to religious ambiguities. Allah, the Most Exalted, says:

{“Whoever disbelieves – should bear (the consequence of) his disbelief. And whoever does righteousness – they are making provisions for themselves”} (Al-Rum: 44).

Allah knows best. May His blessings and Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ), his family and companions.

Sulaiman Ibn Salih Al Kharashi

THE UNAVOIDABLE QUESTIONS

1

The *Shi'ites* believe that 'Ali (عليه السلام) was infallible. Nevertheless, we find him – as confessed by the *Shi'ites* themselves – giving his daughter Umm Kulthum, the full sister of al-Hasan and al-Husain, in marriage to Umar ibn al-Khattab (may Allah be pleased with them all).¹ The *Shi'ites* must, here, accept one of two bitter choices:

First: That 'Ali (عليه السلام) was not infallible, for he gave his daughter in marriage to an unbeliever, and to believe this definitely contradicts the main foundation of the Shi'i ideology. Not only this, it goes further to nullify the claim of infallibility of all other Imams who came after him.

Second: That 'Umar (عليه السلام) was a Muslim, and that 'Ali (عليه السلام) accepted to be his father-in-law.

These are two challenges to the *Shi'ite*.

1 Among the Shi'ite scholars who attested to this marriage are: al-Kulaini in *Furu' al-Kafi* (6/115); al-Tabrasi in his *Tahdhib al-Ahkam*, the chapter on *Adad an-Nisa'* (8/148), and in (2/380), and in his *al-Istibsar* (3/356); al-Mazandarani in his *Manaqib Aal Abi Talib* (3/162); al-'Amili in his *Masalik al-Afham* (1/the Book of Nikah); Murtada 'Alam al-Huda in his *as-Shafi* (p.116); Ibn abi al-Hadid in *Sharh Nahj al-Balaghah* (3/124); al-Ardabili in *Hadiqat as-Shi'ah* (p.277); as-Shaushtari in *Majalis al-Mu'minin* (p.76, 82); al-Majlisi in *Bihar al-Anwar* (621); See also: Abu Mu'az al-Isma'ili's book: 'Umar ibn Khattab's Marriage To Umm Kulthum – Reality, Not A Lie'.

2 The *Shi'ites* claim that Abu Bakr and 'Umar (ﷺ) were unbelievers. But we find that 'Ali (ﷺ), an infallible Imam according to the *Shi'ites*, accepted and endorsed their caliphates, and pledged his allegiance to each of them, one after the other, and never revolted against any of them.

Here one must either accept that 'Ali was not infallible, because he gave his allegiance to two infidels, two *Nasibis*, two oppressors, and accepted them as caliphs, and this, of course, nullifies his infallibility, as he may be seen as an accomplice to oppression, for he had helped two oppressors, an action that is unbecoming of an infallible Imam, or alternatively accept his action to be right, because they (Abu Bakr and 'Umar) were two believing, truthful, and just caliphs. If this latter alternative is the right choice, then the *Shi'ites* have totally gone against their Imam, for we find them abusing, vilifying and speaking ill of Abu Bakr and 'Umar, and do not accept them as caliphs. One is therefore left confused, either to follow the steps of Abu al-Hasan (i.e. 'Ali, ﷺ), or of the *Shi'ites* who have gone against his practice.

3 After the death of Fatima, 'Ali (ﷺ) married a number of wives from whom he had a number of sons, among whom were: 'Abbas ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib, 'Abdullah ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib, Ja'far ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and 'Uthman ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib.

Their mother was Ummul Banin Bint Hizam ibn Darim.²

2 Kashf al-Ghummah Fi Ma'rifat al-A'immah, by 'Ali al-Arbali (2/66).

Also, among them were: 'Ubaidullah ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and Abu Bakr ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib. Their mother was : Laila bint Mas'ud ad-Darimiyyah.³

Among them were: Yahya ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib, Muhammad al-Asghar ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and 'Awn ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib. Their mother was : Asma' bint 'Umais.⁴

Also : Ruqayyah bint 'Ali ibn Abi Talib, 'Umar ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib – who died at the age of 35. Their mother was Umm Habib bint Rabi'ah.⁵

Among them also were Umm al-Hasan bint 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and Ramlah al-Kubra bint 'Ali ibn Abi Talib. Their mother was Umm Mas'ud bint 'Urwah ibn Mas'ud al-Thaqafi.⁶

The question here is, would a father give his dear and most beloved sons the names of his most bitter enemies? What more if that father was 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام)? How would 'Ali name his sons with the names of those you claim to be his enemies? And how can a reasonable person name his beloved ones with the names of his bitter enemies?

Are you people aware of the fact that 'Ali was the first member of the Quraish tribe to name his sons Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman?

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

4 The author of the book *Nahj al-Balaghah* – a reliable Shi'i source – reports that 'Ali (عليه السلام) had asked to be relieved of the caliphate, and said: "Leave me alone, get someone other than me".⁷ This action from the imam nullifies the Shi'i madhhab in totality, for, how can he ask to be relieved from a post you believe has been ordained by Allah and the acceptance of which Allah made compulsory upon all mankind, and which you claim that 'Ali himself used to ask Abu Bakr to return to him?

5 The *Shi'ites* claim that Fatima (عليها السلام), the dear daughter of the Prophet, was disgraced in the time of Abu Bakr (عليه السلام), and that her ribs were broken, and her house was nearly burnt, and was made to miscarry a child in her womb whom they named al-Muhsin.

The question here is, where was 'Ali (عليه السلام) and what was his stance on the issue? Why didn't he collect and deliver what they believe was her right and return it to her, despite what is known historically of his excessive courage and bravery?

6 Many of the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) had marriage relations with the members of the *Ahl al-bait*, more especially Abu Bakr and 'Umar as is attested to by historians and hadith reporters among the Sunni and *Shi'ite* scholars.

- ❑ The Prophet (ﷺ) married 'Ai'shah bint Abi Bakr (عليها السلام);
- ❑ He married Hafsa bint 'Umar ibn Al-Khattab (عليها السلام);
- ❑ He gave two of his daughters (Ruqayyah and Umm

7 *Nahj al-Balaghah* (p.136), see also (p.366-367), and (p.322).

Kulthum) to the third caliph, the generous and modest 'Uthman ibn 'Affan (رضي الله عنه), and that is why he was called Dhu al-Nurain;

- ❑ And his son Aban ibn 'Uthman ibn 'Affan married Umm Kulthum the daughter of Ja'far ibn Abi Talib;
- ❑ Marwan ibn Aban ibn 'Uthman was married to Umm al-Qasim the daughter of al-Hasan ibn al-Hasan ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib;
- ❑ Zaid, the son of 'Amr ibn 'Uthman ibn 'Affan was married to Sukainah, the daughter of Husain (رضي الله عنه);
- ❑ Abdullah ibn 'Amr ibn 'Uthman ibn 'Affan was married to Fatimah bint al-Husain ibn 'Ali (رضي الله عنه);

These are only few examples with regards to the three amongst the rightly guided caliphs, apart from the rest of the *sahabah* who also had marital relations between them and some members of the *Ahl al-Bait*. This buttresses the point that the *Ahl al-Bait* were on good terms with the companions and loved them, and thus these marital and closely tied relations are surely the results of that deep love.⁸

We also find that members of the *Ahl al-Bait* used to give their sons names of the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ), as it is confirmed by both *Shi'ite* and Sunni scholars of history and hadith.

8 For additional information on the relations through marriage between the companions and *Ahl al-Bait*, see the book '*ad-Durr al-Manthur Min Turath ahl al-Bait*', written by the *Shi'ite* jurist 'Ala ad-Din al-Mudarris. It is rich with this and more information on the topic.

'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام), as reported in Shi'i sources – named one of his sons – from his wife Laila bint Mas'ud al-Hanzaliyyah – Abu Bakr. And, as mentioned a while ago, 'Ali was the first member of the Banu Hashim to name his son Abu Bakr.⁹

We also find that al-Hasan ibn 'Ali (عليه السلام) named his sons Abu Bakr, Abdurrahman, Talha and 'Ubaidullah.¹⁰

The same we find with al-Hasan ibn Al-Hasan ibn 'Ali.¹¹

Musa al-Kazim also named his daughter 'A'ishah.¹²

There are – among the *Al al-Bait* – some who took for their kunyah Abu Bakr, in addition to their names, like Zain al-'Abidin ibn 'Ali¹³, and 'Ali ibn Musa (Ar-Rida).¹⁴

As for those who named their sons after 'Umar's name, we find 'Ali (عليه السلام) himself, as he named his son 'Umar Al-Akbar. His mother – as mentioned before – was Umm Habibah bint Rabi'ah.

He was killed in the battle of al-Taff together with his brother al-Husain (عليه السلام). He called his other son 'Umar al-Asghar

9 See: al-Mufid's book, al-Irshad (p.354); and the *Shi'ite* Abu al-Faraj al-Asbahani's Maqatil al-Talibiyyin (p.91), and al-Ya'qubi's Tarikh (2/213).

10 At-Tanbih Wa al-Ishraf, by al-Mas'udi as-Shi'i.

11 Maqatil al-Talibiyyin, by Abil Faraj al-Asbahani (p.188), Dar al-Ma'rifah edition.

12 Kashf al-Ghummah, by al-Arbali (3/26).

13 Ibid (2/317).

14 Maqatil al-Talibiyyin (p.561-562).

whose mother was As-Sahba'a At-Taghlibiyyah, and lived long after his brothers and inherited from them.¹⁵

Al-Hasan also named his two sons Abu Bakr and 'Umar.¹⁶

This is also the case with 'Ali Zain al-'Abidin, Musa al-Kazim, al-Husain ibn Zaid ibn 'Ali, Is'haq ibn al-Hasan ibn 'Ali ibn al-Hasan, al-Hasan ibn 'Ali ibn al-Hasan ibn al-Husain ibn al-Hasan, and many others, but this suffices in respect of the past predecessors of the *Ahl al-Bait*.¹⁷

As regards those that named their daughters after the name of 'A'ishah, amongst them are Musa al-Kazim,¹⁸ and 'Ali al-Hadi.¹⁹

This is with regards to the names of Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'A'ishah (عائشة).

15 Al-Irshad, by al-Mufid (p.354); and Mu'jam Rijal al-Hadith, by Al-Kho'i (13/51); and Maqatil al-Talibiyyin, by Abu al-Faraj al-Asbahani (p.84); and 'Umdat at-Talib (p.361) published in Najaf; and Jala' al-'Uyun, by al-Majlisi (p.570).

16 Al-Irshad, by al-Mufid (p.194); and Muntaha al-Aamal (1/240); and 'Umdat al-Talib (p.81); and Jala' al-'Uyun, by al-Majlisi (p.582); and Mu'jam Rijal al-Hadith, by al-Kho'i (13/29) no. (8716); and Kashf al-Ghummah (2/294).

17 Find a detailed discussion of this topic in 'Maqatil al-Talibiyyin' and other Shi'ite sources. See, for example 'Ad-Durr Al-Manthur Min Turath Ahl al-Bait', by 'Ala' ad-din al-Mudarris (p.65-69).

18 Al-Irshad (p. 302); and al-Fusul al-Muhimmah (p.242); and Kashf al-Ghummah (3/26).

19 Al-Irshad, by al-Mufid (2/312).

7 Al-Kulaini states in his *al-Kafi*: "That the Imams know the times of their deaths, and that they only die if they so wish".²⁰ And we find al-Majlisi – in his '*Bihar al-Anwar*' – mentioning a hadith which says: "None of the Imams died a natural death; each of them was either killed or poisoned".²¹

Now, if the Imam knows the unseen (ghaib), as purported by al-Kulaini and al-Hurr al-'Amili, he would definitely know which food or drink he was given, and if it happened to be poisoned, he would know and decline to eat or drink it. But if he goes on to eat or drink it, knowing fully that it was poisoned, then he must be seen as committing suicide, and the Prophet (ﷺ) has expressly stated that whoever kills himself will be in the Hell fire. Would the *Shi'ites*, then, accept this fate for their Imams?

8 Al-Hasan ibn 'Ali (عليه السلام) ceded the caliphate in favour of Mu'awiyah (عليه السلام), and sought peace with him, at a time when he was strong enough to keep on fighting – considering the enormous number of his army and helpers. On the other side, we find that his brother al-Husain (عليه السلام), revolted against Yazid at a time he was in dire need of an army of helpers to defend his cause, a time when it would have been better to give up and seek peace.

One of these two great men must be right and the other wrong, because, if al-Hasan's secession joined with his ability to fight is the correct idea and action to be taken, then al-Husain's revolt at a time when he was devoid of any

20 *Al-Usul Min al-Kafi* (1/258); and *Al-Fusul Al-Muhimmah* of al-Hurr al-'Amili (p.155).

21 *Bihar al-Anwar* (43/364).

force, would definitely be wrong. And if al-Husain's revolt in weakness was correct, then the secession of al-Hasan when at full strength must be wrong.

This surely puts the *Shi'ites* in a very difficult dilemma, for, if they say that both were correct, they will be combining two contradicting actions, and this will nullify the foundations of their *madhhab*. But if they claim that al-Hasan's action was wrong, then they must consider his being imam to be null and void, and the nullification of his *imamah* would result in nullifying the *imamah* and infallibility of his father who gave him the legal mandate of being imam after him. It is known, according to the *Shi'ite* doctrine, that an infallible imam never gives legacy except in favour of an infallible imam like him.

The same holds true if they say that al-Husain's action was false, for that will necessarily invalidate his *imamah* and infallibility, which will consequently nullify the *imamah* and infallibility of the whole of his progeny, because he was the fundamental source of their *Imamah*, it was through him that the rest among the twelve imams got their *imamah*. If the basic foundation is false, whatever stems from it automatically becomes false.

9 Al-Kulaini says in his *Al-Kafi*:²² "On the authority of a number of our comrades from Ahmad ibn Muhammad from 'Abdullah ibn al-Hajjal from Ahmad ibn 'Umar al-Halabi from Abu Basir, he said: "I called on Abu 'Abdillah (meaning Ja'far as-Sadiq) alaih as-salam, and said to him: 'May I be made your ransom! I would like to ask you a question in

22 *Usul Al-Kafi* (1/239).

privacy. Is there anybody here that may overhear us? The narrator said: 'Abu Abdillah raised a curtain that was between him and the adjoining room, and looked into the room, then said: "Oh, Abu Muhammad, now, ask whatever you so wish". He said: 'I said to him: ' May I be made your ransom!...' He then kept silent for a moment, then said: "Certainly we have the *mushaf* (copy of the Qur'an) of Fatimah (ؑ), do they realize what is the *Mushaf* of Fatimah?". He said: 'I said to him: 'what is the *Mushaf* of Fatimah?'. He said: "It is a *Mushaf* which contains three times the like of this Qur'an of yours, and I swear by Allah, it does not contain a single word of your Qur'an". He said: 'I said to him: 'I swear by Allah, this is Knowledge'. He replied: "Of course, this is Knowledge: but that is not the end of it all".

The question here is: Was the Prophet (ﷺ) aware of this *Mushaf* of Fatimah? If he, being the Messenger of Allah, did not know about it, how did the *Ahl al-Bait* know it? If he did know, why did he conceal it. Allah, The Most Exalted, says:

{ "O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message. " } (Surah Al-Ma'idah: 67)

10 In the first volume of *Kulaini's 'al-Kafi'* a list is mentioned of the names of the reporters that narrated for the *Shi'ites* the hadiths of the Messenger (ﷺ), and the sayings of the *Ahl al-Bait*, among whom are:

Mufaddal ibn 'Umar, Ahmad ibn 'Umar Al-Halabi, 'Umar ibn Aban, 'Umar ibn Udhainah, 'Umar ibn 'Abd Al-Aziz, Ibrahim ibn 'Umar, 'Umar ibn Hanzalah, Musa ibn 'Umar, Al-Abbas ibn 'Umar...etc. The common factor between these

names is the name UMAR, either being the narrators name or the name of his father.

Why would these *Shi'ite* narrators have the name 'Umar?

11 Allah, The Most Exalted, says:

{ "...but give good tidings to the patient, who, when disaster strikes them say, 'Indeed we belong to Allah and indeed to Him we will return. Those are the ones upon whom are blessings from their Lord and mercy. And it is those who are the [rightly] guided.' } (Surah Al-Baqarah: 155-157)

And says:

{ "And those who are patient in poverty and hardship and during battle." } (Surah Al-Baqarah: 177)

It is mentioned in *Nahj al-Balaghah*: "After the death of the Prophet (ﷺ), 'Ali (عليه السلام) called him saying: "Had you not prohibited impatience and commanded people to be patient, we would have dried our tears weeping over your death".²³

It is also mentioned: "That 'Ali (عليه السلام) said: "Whoever beats his hand on his thighs at the time of a disaster, his deeds have been made void".²⁴

Al-Husain (عليه السلام) said to his sister Zainab at Karbala: "My sister, I swear by Allah, and I beg you in the name of Allah to preserve my oath, that : If I am killed you should not

23 Nahj al-Balaghah (p.576), and see: Mustadrak al-Wasa'il (2/445)..

24 See: al-Khisal of as-Saduq (p.621); and Wasa'il as-Shi'ah (3/270).

tear your gown for me, nor should you scratch your face with your finger nails, and do not wail and lament over my martyrdom".²⁵

Abu Ja'far al-Qummi reports that Amir al-Mu'minin (Ali ibn Abi Talib) radiyallahu 'anhu, when teaching his companions, once said: "Do not dress in black, for it is the dressing of Pharoah".²⁶

In the book '*Tafsir as-Safi*', in explaining the meaning of the verse:

{ "...nor will they disobey you in what is right." } (*Surah al-Mumtahinah:12*)

The author said that the Prophet (ﷺ) accepted the pledge of allegiance from women under the condition that they should not paint their clothes in black, nor should they tear their gowns, and that they should not wail and lament on disasters.

Al-Kulaini, in his '*Furu' al-Kafi*' reports that the Prophet (ﷺ) admonished Fatimah (ؓ), saying: "Do not scratch your face on my death, nor should you loosen your hair, nor should you wail, nor should you hire a mourner to weep for me".²⁷

We also find the *Shi'ite* Sheikh Muhammad ibn al-Husain ibn Babawaih al-Qummi – whom they nicknamed 'as-Saduq',

25 These words are reported by the author of Muntaha al-Amaal (1/24) in the Persian language..

26 Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Babwaih al-Qummi, 'Man La Yahduruh al-Faqih' (1/232); It is also reported by al-Hurr al-Amili in his 'Wasa'il ash-Shi'ah' (2/916).

27 *Furu' al-Kafi* (5/527).

saying: "Among the words which the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) was reported to have been the first to pronounce them was: "Bewailing the dead is an act of Jahiliyyah".²⁸

A number of their scholars - al-Majlisi, an-Nuri, al-Barujardi – also report from the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), that he said: "Allah detests two cursed sounds: wailing at the time of disaster, and a sound with a melody, meaning: wailing and singing".²⁹

The question after all these narratives is: why do the *shi'ites* violate the true teachings mentioned in them. Whom should we believe? Is it the Prophet (ﷺ) and the *Ahlul Bait*, or the *Shi'ite Mullahs*?

12 If the Tatbir³⁰ and wailing and the beating of the chests are acts on which one will be greatly rewarded as they claim,³¹ why then do the *mullahs* not practice them?

13 If the *Shi'ites'* claims are true that all of the thousands of companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) who attended the gathering

28 As-Saduq in 'Man La Yahduruh al-Faqih' (4/271-272); it has been reported also by Al-Hurr Al-Amili in his 'Wasa'il As-Shi'ah' (2/915); and Yusuf al-Bahrani in 'al-Hada'iq al-Nadira' (4/149); and al-Hajj Husain al-Barujardi in 'Jami' Ahadith As-Shi'ah' (3/488); and Muhammad Baqir al-Majlisi in 'Bihar al-Anwar' (82/103) with the words: 'Wailing is an act of Jahiliyyah'.

29 Reported by al-Majlisi in 'Bihar al-Anwar' (82/103); also reported in Mustadrak al-Wasa'il (1/143-144); Jami' Ahadith ash-Shi'ah (3/488); Man La Yahduruh al-Faqih (2/271).

30 Tatbir is the beating of the heads to bleed as practiced by the Shi'ites on the day of Ashuraa . See: at-Tibrizi's 'Sirat an-Najah' (1/432).

31 See: 'Irshad as-Sa'il' (p.184).

at *Ghadir Khum* heard the alleged *wasiyyah* (the will) in respect of 'Ali (عليه السلام), that he would be the caliph after the Prophet (ﷺ), why didn't any of that large number of people – either 'Ammar ibn Yasir, or al-Miqdad, or Salman al-Farisi – fight to defend 'Ali's cause? None of them ever came to Abu Bakr and boldly asked him: why did you 'usurp' the right of 'Ali to the caliphate, while you know what the Prophet (ﷺ) said at *Ghadir Khum*?

14 At the time of the Prophet (ﷺ)'s death when he asked for writing material in order to commit to writing what will save the ummah from going astray, why didn't 'Ali speak despite his courage and bravery, and that he feared no one but Allah?

15 Didn't the *Shi'ites* say that most of the narratives in the book '*al-Kafi*' are weak, and that they do not claim any of their books to be authentic apart from the Qur'an? Why then would they falsely claim that there are divine exegeses of the Qur'an found in that book?

16 Worship is only dedicated to Allah alone. Allah, the Most Exalted, says:

{*"Rather, worship [only] Allah."*} (*Surah az-Zumar: 66*)

Why then do the *Shi'ites* name themselves 'Abd al-Husain', 'Abd 'Ali', 'Abd az-Zahra'a', and 'Abd al-Imam', and why didn't the Imams name their sons with these kinds of names? Is it correct to claim that the meaning of this genitive construction 'Abd al-Husain' is 'the servant of al-Husain', after the martyrdom of al-Husain (عليه السلام)? Is it logically acceptable that the person so named serves al-Husain by

giving him food or drink, or pouring him water to perform ablution, as is the usual duty of a servant?

17 If 'Ali (عليه السلام) certainly knew that he was the one eligible for the caliphate immediately after the Prophet (ﷺ), and that Allah has ordained that explicitly, why then did he pledge his allegiance to Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman (عليه السلام)?

If you argue that he was weak and powerless, then that means he was not eligible for the *Imamah*, for, a weak and powerless person is not right for the position of an Imam, because the *Imamah* is only for one who has the power and full capability to bear its burdens.

And if you claim that he was potent and capable, only that he did not act, then he should be seen as betraying the post, and a betrayer is not eligible for *Imamah*, and he could not be relied upon in fulfilling what is expected of him towards his subjects.

Far be he from all these degrading qualities.

So what should be your answer, if at all you have any?

18 When 'Ali (عليه السلام) ascended to the throne of the caliphate he did not go against his predecessors (Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman). He did not bring out a Qur'an different from that which was with them, nor did he reject anything from any of them, nay, it was reported through many sound and authentic narratives that he announced on his pulpit, that: "The best of this ummah after its Prophet was Abu Bakr and 'Umar". He did not legalize mut'ah (temporary marriage), nor did he return the land of Fadak, nor make the *tamattu'*

of Hajj compulsory on all people, nor did he generalize the words: *hayya ala khairil 'ama'* in the call to prayer, and he did not remove the statement: *As-Salah khairum minan naum* from the call to *Fajr* prayer.

Had Abu Bakr and 'Umar been unbelievers who usurped the caliphate from him – as you claim – 'Ali would have mentioned that at the time he gained power and authority. Why didn't he do that? Nay, totally on the contrary, he praised them.

If you are his true followers, you should be content with what he was content with, or you boldly accuse him of betraying the Ummah for failing to make the issue known to them, far be he from that.

19 The *Shi'ites* claim that the rightly guided caliphs were unbelievers. If that is so, how could Allah help them and allow them conquer many countries, and make Islam victorious and more powerful during their rule, and feared by all its enemies? The Muslims never witnessed a time in history in which Allah made Islam more powerful than the time of those caliphs.

Would this be in line with Allah's usual practice of disappointing and defeating the unbelievers and hypocrites?

While ironically, we find that in the days of the assumed infallible imam whose *imamah* you claim Allah has made a grace and mercy for the people, the ummah was divided, its members fighting one another, so badly that the enemies of Islam held out hopes of gaining victory over Islam and

Muslims. What mercy and grace was gained from the *imamah* of the assumed infallible, if at all that you reason?

20 The *Shi'ites* claim that Mu'awiyah was an unbeliever, but then we find that al-Hasan ibn 'Ali had ceded the caliphate in his favour, while – according to the *Shi'ites* – he was the incumbent infallible imam. One of two things here is for sure: either that he ceded the caliphate in favour of a kafir (unbeliever), and this is against his assumed infallibility, or that Mu'awiyah was a Muslim.³²

21 Did the Prophet (ﷺ) ever prostrate himself on the so called At-Turbah al-Husainiyyah (the soil of al-Husain's tomb), on which the *Shi'ites* prostrate themselves?

If the answer is in the affirmative, we say: this is sheer lie, by the Lord of the Ka'bah.

And if they say he did not do so, we say to them: Are you, then, more guided to the right path than the Messenger (ﷺ)?

Even though *Shi'ite* narratives assert that Angel Jibril once came to the Prophet (ﷺ) with a handful of the soil of Karbala.

22 The *Shi'ites* claim that the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) had changed their religion after his death and became apostates.

32 Not only that, al-Hasan must have seen in Mu'awiyah the prospects of a strong leader able to bring harmony to the Ummah and end its crises, and that al-Hasan did not believe in the so called wilayah of the *Ahl al-Bait*. (Translator).

The question here is, were they Twelver *Shi'ites* before his death, then later turned down the religion and changed to become followers of the *Sunnah*?

Or, were they *Ahl as-Sunnah* before his death, then changed to Twelver *Shi'ites*?, because the word 'change' means passing from one state or condition to another.

23 It is known that al-Hasan (ﷺ) was the son of 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (ﷺ), and his mother was Fatimah (ﷺ). He was one of the members of the cloak,³³ and one of the twelve believed by the *Shi'ites* to be infallible Imams. He was equal in all terms to his brother, al-Husain. However, why were his progeny deprived of the *Imamah*, and instead it remained in the progeny of al-Husain (may Allah be pleased with both)? They were of the same father and mother, and each of them was a *sayyid* (leader). Moreover, al-Hasan excels above al-Husain by a degree, that is he was older than him, and was his father's first born.

Is there any convincing answer to this?

24 Why did 'Ali not lead the people in a single prayer in the days of the Prophet's last illness, so long as he was believed to be the imam after him – as you claim?, because the lesser

33 This refers to what is reported in the hadith that the Prophet (ﷺ) once came out in a cloak made of black wool. When Al-Hasan came, he asked him to enter into its cover. Al-Husain also came and he asked him to enter. Then came Fatimah, and he made her enter. Then later came 'Ali, and he also entered. He then recited: {"Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity, O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification"} (*Al-Ahzab: 33*). Reported by Muslim in his Saheeh, in the chapter of the Virtues of the Companions.

imamah (leading prayer) is a sign of the major *imamah* (the caliphate).

25 You claim that the reason for which your twelfth imam is hidden in the *sirdab* (basement), is for fear of the oppressors. Then why does he remain hidden despite the fact that the fear and danger was overcome in the days of some *Shi'ite* governments in history, like the Fatimids, the Buwaihiyyins and the Safavids, and lastly the present Iranian government?

Why doesn't he come out, now that the *Shi'ites* have the power to protect and help him in their own country, more especially that their number is in the millions, and they always cry out everyday: 'May we be made your ransom!'.

26 The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) took the company of Abu Bakr during his migration thereby preserving him to remain alive with him, while he left 'Ali ibn Abi Talib in his bed exposed to the danger of being killed or injured. Would 'Ali be left exposed to the danger of being killed, had he been an imam, a legate and a divinely ordained caliph, while Abu Bakr, whose death would have no effect on the *imamah* and its order of sequence, be saved to live?

The question arising here is: Who among the two was more deserving to live without being injured by a thorn or prick, much less being exposed to the danger of being killed?

If you argue that he ('Ali) knew the unseen (*ghaib*), then what virtue is there in his sleeping in the Prophet's bed knowing that nothing will happen?

27 *Taqiyyah* is only resorted to when one is in the state of fear. Fear is of two types:

- ❑ Fear of being killed.
- ❑ Fear of being subjected to some difficulty or physical torture, or being abused, cursed or disgraced.

The fear of being killed, going by the Shi'i belief, is dismissed, in the case of the imams for two reasons:

- ❑ That the deaths of the twelve imams only occur by their consent.
- ❑ That the imams know all that occurred in the past and what will occur in the future. Therefore, - as the *Shi'ites* claim - they know their appointed times, the mode of their deaths and its specific time.

So, before the appointed time of their deaths they are never afraid of being killed, and they need not become hypocrites in their religion, and deceive the common Muslims by acting contrary to their own conscience.

As for the fear of being subjected to difficulty etc. it is doubtless that bearing such burdens and exercising patience on them, is one of the duties of the scholars, and the members of the Prophet's household are more deserving to bear them in defending the cause of their grandfather's deen.

Why the *taqiyyah* then?

28 The aim of appointing an imam, according to the *Shi'ites*, is to remove oppression and every evil from all cities and villages, and champion the cause of justice and fairness.

The question here is, do you claim that there has always been an infallible imam in every city and village of the world, an infallible imam preventing any oppression to befall the people, or not?

If you do claim that, we say, this is sheer obstinacy and denial of the truth. Do you claim that there is an infallible imam in the countries of the unbelievers among the polytheist and people of the Book? Was there an infallible imam in Syria with Mu'awiyah?

If you rather say no, there is only one imam, but has deputies in the rest of the cities and villages of the world, we say, are the deputies in all cities of the earth or in some of them?

If you say, in all cities of the world, we say, this is just another obstinacy.

If you say, no, the deputies are in some cities not others, we say, all cities and villages of the world do need the infallible, and why do you discriminate between them?

29 Al-Kulaini in his *al-Kafi* assigned a specific chapter to which he gave the title: "*Women Do Not Inherit Anything of Real Estate*". He reported from Abu Ja'far, that he said: "Women do not inherit anything of land and real estate".³⁴

34 *Furu' Al-Kafi* (7/127).

Al-Tusi, in his 'al-Tahdhib',³⁵ also reported from Maysar, that he said: 'I asked Abu Abdillah about women, what are they entitled to with regards to inheritance?' He said: "They are entitled to the equivalent of the value of the blocks, labour cost of the building, the wood and the canes. As for the land itself and the real estate, they have no right of inheritance in them".

He also reported on the authority of Muhammad ibn Muslim from Abu Ja'far that he said: "Women do not inherit anything of land and real estate". And on the authority of 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yun from one of them, that he said: "Women are entitled to nothing in houses and real estates".

These narratives are generic in their nature and context, to include all women of all degrees and calibres, and they contain nothing to indicate one woman is exempt from the generalized rule, neither Fatimah (عليها السلام) nor any other woman.

Based on this, and according to the Shi'i *madhhab*, Fatimah (عليها السلام) has no right to demand any share of the Prophet's (ﷺ) inheritance. Furthermore, according to the Shi'i doctrine, whatever belongs to the Messenger (ﷺ) belongs to the Imam. Al-Kulaini reports 'on the authority of Muhammad ibn Yahya from Ahmad ibn Muhammad, from 'Amr ibn Shimr from Jabir from Abu Ja'far, he said: The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: "Allah created Adam (عليه السلام) and granted him the whole world as a fief. And whatever belongs to Adam belongs to the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), and whatever belongs to the

35 (2/254).

Messenger belongs to the imams among the household of Muhammad (ﷺ)".³⁶

The first imam after the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) – based on the Shi'i belief – was 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (ﷺ). As such, he was the right person to ask for the land of Fadak not Fatimah (ﷺ), and he did not do that. Instead we find him saying: "If I so wish, I would lay my hands on the most purified of this honey, the best part of that wheat and the best fabric of that silk, but no, my whims will never defeat me, and my greediness will never lead me to the stage of being selective in what I eat. May be there is in Hijaz or Yamamah someone that has no hope of getting a loaf of bread, and has never eaten his fill".³⁷

30 Why did Abu Bakr (ﷺ) fight the apostates? Not only that, he made the declaration: "By Allah, if they refuse to hand over to me (for their *zakkah*) the like of a camel's cord they used to give to the Prophet (ﷺ) I would surely fight them for it. On the other hand, the *Shi'ites* believe that 'Ali (ﷺ) couldn't bring before the public the copy of the Qur'an he allegedly wrote directly from the mouth of the Prophet (ﷺ), for his fear that people may leave the religion and become apostates, despite the fact that he was the caliph, bearing the strongest qualities, in addition to the divine backing they claim he had at that time.

Here 'Ali refused to make public that copy of the Qur'an lest people become apostates, and by that action – going by the

36 *Usul Al-Kafi*, the Book of Hujjah, under the Chapter titled: "The Whole Earth Belongs To The Imam" (1/476).

37 *Nahj Al-Balaghah* (1/211).

Shi'ites line of thinking – he left people to become astray, but Abu Bakr swore to fight the apostates over a camel's cord.

31 Both *Ahl as-Sunnah* and the *Shi'ites* agree on the fact that 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام) was a warrior of unsurpassable bravery, and that he feared no one in Allah's cause. This bravery has been with him a permanent character, and there was never a moment when 'Ali was not considered brave by all, throughout his life and up to the time he was killed by 'Abd Ar-Rahman ibn Muljim. Moreover, the *Shi'ites*, as all know, declare that 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام) was the legatee bearing the mandate of the imamah after the Prophet (ﷺ) without any interruption.

Did 'Ali's bravery relinquish after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ) that he pledged allegiance to Abu Bakr, then after Abu Bakr, to 'Umar ibn Al-Khattab, and then to Uthman ibn 'Affan (عليه السلام)?

Was he weak enough – far be he from that – to ascend the Prophet's pulpit even once in the caliphate of one of those three and make the bold announcement that the caliphate was usurped from him, and that he was more entitled to be the caliph because he was the *wasi*?

Why didn't he do that despite his bravery and boldness, and despite the enormous number of his helpers and sympathizers?

32 The *hadith* of *kisa'a* that has been previously mentioned and the issue of purification in it affects four persons from 'Ali's household. What evidence do the *Shi'ites* give to

substantiate the inclusion of other people in the promise of purification and infallibility, apart from those four?

33 The *Shi'ites* report from Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq, who (they claim) was the founder of the so called Ja'fari madhhab, that he said with full pride: "I was born by Abu Bakr twice",³⁸ because his lineage goes back to Abu Bakr through two routes:

- ❑ Through his mother Fatimah the daughter of Qasim ibn Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr.
- ❑ Through his maternal grandmother Asma' bint 'Abd Ar-Rahman ibn Abu Bakr, who was the mother of Fatimah bint Qasim ibn Muhammad ibn Abu Bakr.

But despite that we find the *Shi'ites* reporting false and concocted narratives from the same Ja'far as-Sadiq in which he vilifies and speaks ill of his grandfather Abu Bakr.

How inconsistent is it for him to feel and express his pride about his grandfather on one side, and then on another side, to vilify him. This type of action can come from an ignorant common person, not from an imam the *Shi'ites* consider the most rich in knowledge and the most pious person on earth in his days, in addition to the fact that no one ever coerced him into praising or vilifying anybody.

34 The al-Aqsa Masjid was liberated in the days of 'Umar (رضي الله عنه), then again, later in the days of the Sunni commander Salahuddin al-Ayyubi rahimahullah.

38 Al-Arbali, Kashf al-Ghummah (2/373).

What achievements could the *Shi'ites* boast of in the span of the history of Islam?

Have they ever conquered a small piece of land in the name of Islam? Or have they ever caused any damage to an enemy of Islam and the Muslims, in the name of Islam?

35 The *Shi'ites* claim that 'Umar hated 'Ali (ﷺ), but then, we find that 'Umar, at the time he went to officially collect the keys of Bait al-Maqdis, appointed him to be in charge of Madinah, knowing fully that if something bad were to befall him on his way, 'Ali would assume authority. What kind of hatred is this?

36 *Shi'ite* scholars are of the opinion that the limbs that must be involved in prostration in prayer are eight: the forehead, the nose, the two palms, the two knees, and the two toes. These must necessarily have contact with the ground in the state of prostration.³⁹

Then we find them claiming that it is compulsory on one not to prostrate on anything edible or that is worn, and that is why they put a piece of dried mud under their foreheads.⁴⁰

Why don't they put the piece of mud under each and every one of the mentioned eight limbs of prostration?

37 The *Shi'ites* claim that when their Mahdi comes he will rule under the Law of the household of David.

39 Al-Hurr Al-'Amili, *Wasa'il As-Shi'ah* (3/598).

40 See: Al-Hilli, *Al-Jami' Lis-Shara'i'* (p.70).

What of the law of Muhammad (ﷺ) which abrogated all previous laws?

38 Why would the *Shi'ite* Mahdi, on his advent, be in peace and harmony with the Jews and Christians, but would kill the Arabs and the Quraish in particular? Were Muhammad (ﷺ) and the imams not from the Quraish and the Arabs?

39 The *Shi'ites* believe that mothers of the Imams bore their pregnancies (not inside their wombs) but by the side of the body, and delivered them (not through the normal way) but through their right thighs.⁴¹

Wasn't Muhammad (ﷺ) - the best of all Prophets and the most noble human being ever on earth - borne inside the womb of his mother and delivered in the normal way?

40 They also report from Abu Abdillah Ja'far as-Sadiq that he said: "The person entitled to this issue (meaning the Mahdi) is a man no one mentions by his name except an unbeliever".⁴²

Notwithstanding that, we find them reporting from Abu Muhammad al-Hasan al-'Askari that he said to the mother of the assumed Mahdi: "You will give birth to a male child, his name is Muhammad and he will be the *qa'im* (the imam in charge) after me...".⁴³

41 Al-Mas'udi, 'Ithbat Al-Wasiyyah' (p.196).

42 Ni'matullah al-Jaza'iri, 'al-Anwar al-Nu'maniyyah' (2/53).

43 Ibid (2/55).

What a contradiction! There you say whoever calls him by his name is an unbeliever, and here you say al-Hasan al-'Askari called him Muhammad.

41 'Abdullah ibn Ja'far as-Sadiq was a full brother of Isma'il ibn Ja'far as-Sadiq, and their mother was Fatimah the daughter of al-Hasan ibn 'Ali ibn al-Husain ibn 'Ali ibn abi Talib (عليه السلام).

So, both – according to you – are leaders from the household of al-Husain from their father's side as well as from their mother's side.

Then why was 'Abdullah ibn Ja'far deprived of the *imamah* after his full brother Isma'il who died before his father?

42 Al-Kulaini reports in his *al-Kafi*⁴⁴ on the authority of Ahmad ibn Muhammad from Abu Abdillah, that he said: "Wearing black is reprehensible except in three things: the shoe, the turban and the cloak".

It is also reported from him (Abu Abdillah) in the Book of Dressing from the Prophet (ﷺ) that he detests wearing black except in three: the shoe, the cloak and the turban".⁴⁵

Al-Hurr al-'Amili reports in his *al-Wasa'il* from as-Saduq from Muhammad ibn Sulaiman in the form of mursals⁴⁶ from

44 Reported from him by al-Hurr al'Amili in his *al-Wasa'il* (3/278); See also *Furu' al-Kafi* (6/449).

45 Reported in *al-Kafi* (2/205), chapter on Wearing Black, published in Teheran in the year 1315 A.H., but the wording there is : "The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) detests wearing black except in three things", and the turban is mentioned before the cloak.

46 A mural is the chain of narrators in which one or more narrators

Abu Abdillah, that he said: 'I said to him: "Can I pray with a black cap? He said: "No, do not pray with it, for it is the dress of the people of Hell".⁴⁷

He (al-Hurr al-'Amili) also reported from as-Saduq in *al-Faqih* from amir al-mu'minin (leader of the Faithful, meaning 'Ali عليه السلام), in a mursal report, also in the book '*al-'Ilal*' and '*al-Khisal*', as mentioned in *al-Wasa'il* but in a *musnad*⁴⁸ report, that he said to his companions: "Do not wear black dresses, because it is the dress of Pharaoh".

He also reported via his own chain of narration, as in his '*al-Wasa'il*' on the authority of Hudhaifah ibn Mansur, he said: 'I was with Abu Abdullah in al-Heerah when the messenger of the caliph Abu al-'Abbas came to call him, and he demanded to be given a raincoat.⁴⁹

Nay, some narratives in the *Shi'ite* literature even clearly state that black is the favourite colour of their enemies, that is the Abbasids.

from the beginning are missing.

47 Al-Wasa'il (3/281, chapter No.20, Hadith No.3, on the dress of the praying person); and as-Saduq in his *al-Faqih* (2/232), he said: as-Sadiq was asked about praying with a cap, and he said: Do not pray wearing it, because it is the dress of the people of Hell' See: Wasa'il as-Shi'ah (3/281).

48 Musnad here is the opposite of mursal, meaning the chain of narrators in which no narrator is missing.

49 As-Saduq, *Man La Yahduruh al-Faqih* (1/251); al-Hurr in his *al-Wasa'il* (3/278) reported that from as-Saduq, from the chapters on the dress of the praying person. The second narrative is in *al-Wasa'il* (3/279), hadith No. 7, chapters on the dress of the praying person; See *al-Faqih* (2/252), and *al-Kafi* (2/205).

An example of such narratives is what is reported from as-Saduq in his '*al-Faqih*' that he said: It has been reported that Angel Gabriel came to the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) while he (Gabriel) was wearing a black qaba (an outer garment with full-length sleeves), and a girdle in which there was a dagger. The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said to him: O Gabriel, what dress is this? He said: this is the dress of the progeny of your uncle 'Abbas. The Prophet (ﷺ) went to 'Abbas and said to him: "O uncle, woe to my progeny from yours". He said: O Messenger of Allah, should I castrate myself?. The Prophet said: "The Pen has written whatever has been determined to happen". It is apparent from this that the term 'people of Hell' in the previous narratives refers to those who would be tortured in the hell and those who have been destined to enter Hell as their permanent abode on the day of Judgement, meaning, Pharaoh and his likes among the parties of oppression and rebellion. And the likes of the Abbasid caliphs and others from among the infidels of this blessed Ummah and the early preceding nations that used to wear black dresses".⁵⁰

Another example is what is reported from as-Saduq in '*al-Faqih*' on the authority of Isma'il ibn Muslim from *as-Sadiq* (Ja'far), that he said: "Allah said to one of His Prophets alaihim assalam: "Tell the believers: Do not wear the dress of my enemies, and do not eat the food of my enemies, and do not follow the steps of my enemies, lest you become my enemies like them".⁵¹

50 Aufa al-'Ilal Wa al-Khisal, as reported in al-Wasa'il, see also al-Faqih (Man La Yahduruh al-Faqih (2/252).

51 Al-Faqih (1/252), see 'Wasa'il as-Shi'ah' (4/384); and 'Bihar al-Anwar (2/291), (28/48).

In the book '*Uyun al-Akhbar*', after mentioning the aforementioned narrative through a different isnad from 'Ali ibn abi Talib (عليه السلام) from the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), the author added: 'The dress of the enemies is black in colour, their food is wine, liquor, *fiqa*', clay and *jari* fish, the *marmahi*, *zamir* and *tafi*, and any fish that has no scales, and the flesh of *dabb* and rabbit... The ways of the enemies are places of suspicion, of drinking liquor, and places of amusement and play, the places of those that judge unjustly, and where the Imams and the believers are being vilified, and places of sinners, oppressors and mischief makers".⁵²

After all these narratives that condemn and discourage dressing in black, and that it is the colour of the enemies of the *Shi'ites*, why do the *Shi'ites* wear black and are very fond of that, nay, regard it to be the dress of the Masters?

43 If somebody wants to become a *Shi'ite*, which of the different and conflicting Shi'i denominations should he join? The Imamiyyah or Isma'iliyyah, or Nusairiyyah, or Zaidiyyah or Duruz etc, while each sect among them claims to have originated from the *Ahlul Bait* and assumes to champion their cause, and believes in the issue of *imamah* and vilifies the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ)? All of them also believe in the *imamah* of 'Ali ibn abi Talib (عليه السلام) and that it is a fundamental article of faith, and that 'Ali was supposed to be the caliph after the Prophet without any interruption, and that the real and original deen is with them.

52 Uyun al-Akhbar (1/26).

44 We find the *Shi'ites* relying heavily on the *hadith* of *al-Kisa* in their effort to establish the doctrine of the *imamah* of the twelve assumed imams.

The question here is: Fatimah (ﷺ) was explicitly mentioned in the said *hadith*, but why was she deprived of the *imamah* and not mentioned among the Imams of the *Shi'ites*?

45 One of the fundamental conditions of becoming an imam – according to the Shi'i doctrine – is that one must be a *mukallaf* (i.e. a legally liable and capable person), and that means he must attain maturity and be sane.

Ironically, we find that the *imamate* of their so-called hidden Imam Muhammad al-'Askari, was confirmed while he was only 3 or 5 years of age. Why was that particular condition waived in his case?

46 Were there any books revealed to the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) apart from the Qur'an of which 'Ali (ﷺ) specially took possession?

If you say, No, then how do you explain the following narratives?:

❑ **On the Issue of What you call 'Al-Jami'ah'.**

On the authority of Abu Basir from Abu Abdillah, that he said: O, Abu Muhammad, We have in our possession the Jami'ah, do they realize what is the Jami'ah? He said: 'I said to him: 'May I be made your ransom!, what is the Jami'ah?

He said: "It is a book about seventy cubits in length, with the cubit of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), and from the dictation of his own mouth, written with the right hand of 'Ali (عليه السلام). In it is mentioned every lawful and unlawful matter, and everything the people may be in need of, even the amount to be paid as indemnity in lieu of a scratch..."⁵³

Mark carefully his saying: "...and everything the people may be in need of". Why then was it hidden, and why have we been deprived of it and of what it contains?

Moreover, is this not concealment of knowledge?

❑ The Namus Scripture

It has been reported on the authority of Ar-Rida - in the hadith which discusses the signs of the imam - that he said: "One of the signs of the imam is that he will be in possession of a scripture containing the names of the followers of the imams (i.e. *Shi'ites*) up to the day of Judgement, and another scripture containing the names of their enemies to the day of Judgement".⁵⁴

What kind of scripture is this that contains the names of all *Shi'ites* up to the day of Judgement?

If the names of all the *Shi'ites* in Iran alone would be committed to writing we would need a book made of, at least, a hundred volumes.

53 *Al-Kafi* (1/239).

54 *Bihar Al-Anwar* (25/117).

❑ The Al-'Abitah Scripture

'Narrated from Amirul Mu'minin, that he said: "By Allah, I have in my possession many scriptures among the special belongings of the Prophet (ﷺ) and his household. Among those scriptures is one that is called '*al-'Abitah*', nothing is reported as heavy on the 'Arabs like that scripture. It contains names of sixty evil tribes of the 'Arabs who have no share whatsoever in Islam".⁵⁵

This narrative is unacceptable as well as logically inconsistent. If this number of tribes has no share in Islam, then it means not a single Muslim has any share in the deen of Allah.

Note that this stern and unjust ruling only pertains to 'Arab tribes, an action from which one easily discerns the bitter smell of '*Shu'ubiyyah*'.⁵⁶

55 Ibid (26/37).

56 *Shu'ubiyyah*, derived from the word '*Sha'b*', meaning nation or people etc. is a movement within the early Islamic commonwealth of nations which refused to recognize the privileged position of the 'Arabs. Some of them, especially the Persian Muslims, even believe that other nations are in a more privileged position than the 'Arabs, and this later on led to their hatred of the 'Arabs as a nation, and they sought ways of improving Persian culture and making it supreme over other civilizations, discouraging whatever is related to the 'Arabs. They even see in some teachings of Islam a threat to their ancient Persian civilization, as such they term it 'Arabism' and fight it with all their might. (Translator).

❑ The Dhu'abatus Saif⁵⁷ Scripture

On the authority of Abu Basir from Abu Abdullah (عليه السلام), that a small scripture was tied to the tuft of the sword of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) which contains some words each of which opens one thousand other words.⁵⁸ Abu Basir said: Abu Abdullah said: "Only two of those words were let out up to this hour".⁵⁹

The question here is: Where are the rest of the letters or words? Why are they also not let out for the *Shi'ites* to benefit from the knowledge they contain?

Or will they remain concealed up to the time the supposed Mahdi will appear, which implies that generations after generations of this Ummah will be doomed for being deprived of the vast amount of knowledge that is hidden with the supposed Mahdi in his hiding place (the *Sirdab*).

❑ 'Ali's Scripture

This is a different scripture found together with that of the Dhu'abatus Saif.

57 Dhu'abat al-Saif means the tuft of the sword. They believe that there was a scripture tied to the sword of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ).

58 In the original source (*Bihar al-Anwar* 26/56): "...opens one thousand chapters". The import of this narrative is that these words or letters were abbreviations or signs when deciphered lead to a vast amount of knowledge, such that each word or letter is a key to thousands of chapters known only to the *Ahl al-Bait*.

59 *Bihar al-Anwar* (26/56); See Basa'ir al-Darajat (p.89).

On the authority of Abu Abdullah, that he said: "A scripture was found on the tuft of the sword of the Prophet (ﷺ), in which is written: "In the Name of Allah, The Most Beneficent, The Most Merciful. The most insolent person on the day of Judgement is he who killed someone other than his killer,⁶⁰ and one who beats someone other than the one that beat him. Whoever gives his fidelity to other than his former masters is an unbeliever rejecting what Allah has revealed to Muhammad (ﷺ). And whoever invents an abominable act or gives cover to one who invents an abominable act, Allah will not accept from him – on the day of Judgement – neither a *fard* nor a *nafl*"^{61 62}.

❑ Al-Jafr

There are two kinds of al-Jafr:

The White Jafr, and the Red one.

On the authority of Abu al-'Ala,⁶³ he said: I heard Abu 'Abdullah saying: "I possess the white Jafr". I said:

60 Meaning one who killed someone other than the one who wanted to kill him, or killed someone who did not kill any of his relatives.

61 That is, neither an obligatory deed nor a supererogatory one will be accepted from him. This is one of the meanings given to this kind of statements that is reported from the Prophet (ﷺ) in the books of hadith. As for this particular narrative, they mentioned in their explanations of the words of *Bihar al-Anwar* that Abu Abdullah explained Sarf to mean repentance, while 'Adl' to mean ransom. See *Bihar al-Anwar* (27/65).

62 *Bihar al-Anwar* (27/65).

63 In the original source (*Al-Kafi* 1/240): 'from al-Husain ibn Abu al-'Ala'.

'What does it contain?' He said: "The Zabur (Psalms) of David, the Torah of Moses, the Injil (Gospel) of Jesus, the scriptures of Abraham (ﷺ), the lawful, the unlawful..., and I possess the red Jafr". I said: 'What is in the red Jafr?' He said: "Weapon, and that will not be opened but for spilling blood. The Sword-bearer⁶⁴ will be the person to open it". Abdullah ibn Abu al-Ya'fur said to him: 'May Allah make you better! Are al-Hasan's progeny aware of this?' He said: "Indeed, by Allah, they know it as they know that the night is night, and the day is day, but they will deny it out of sheer envy and love for this world. Would they seek truth with truth it would have been better for them".⁶⁵

Note here, the claim that the Zabur of Dawud, the Torah of Musa, the Injil of Isa and the scriptures of Ibrahim (ﷺ), and all lawful and unlawful matters are contained in the mentioned script. Why then do you conceal it?

❑ Mushaf Fatimah

- On the authority of 'Ali ibn Sa'id from Abu Abdullah (ﷺ), that he said: "By Allah, we possess the scripture of Fatimah. It contains not a single verse of the Book of Allah, and that it was dictated by the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) written by the hands of 'Ali (ﷺ)".⁶⁶

64 They mean by the sword-bearer the assumed Mahdi.

65 *Usul al-Kafi* (1/240).

66 *Bihar al-Anwar* (26/41).

- On the authority of Muhammad ibn Muslim from one of them⁶⁷: "And Fatimah (عليها السلام) left a scripture. It was not a copy of the Qur'an, but a statement revealed to her by Allah and dictated by the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), and written down by 'Ali (عليه السلام)".⁶⁸
- On the authority of 'Ali ibn abi Hamzah from Abu Abdullah (عليه السلام), that he said: "We possess the *Mushaf* (scripture) of Fatimah (عليها السلام). Know surely, by Allah, that it contains not a word of the Qur'an, but was dictated by the Prophet (ﷺ) and written down by 'Ali (عليه السلام)".⁶⁹

If the scripture was actually dictated by the Messenger of Allah and written down by 'Ali, why then did he hide it from the ummah?

Allah has commanded His Messenger (ﷺ) to convey what was revealed to him. He says:

"O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message." (Surah Al-Ma'idah: 67).

How could the Messenger hide this Qur'an from all the Muslims despite this strong warning. How could 'Ali

67 They mean here that this narrative has been reported from either of their two Imams (Ja'far As-Sadiq or his father al-Baqir), i.e. they are not sure to whom among the two the statement is ascribed.

68 Bihar al-Anwar (26/42).

69 Ibi (26/48-49).

and the imams after him conceal it from their *Shi'ite* followers? Isn't this a betrayal of trust?

❑ The Torah, the Gospel and the Psalms

On the authority of Abu Abdullah that he used to recite the Gospels, the Torah and the Psalms in the Syrian language.⁷⁰

What would 'Ali and the imams after him do with the Psalms, the Torah and the Gospels to the extent that one of them inherits them from the other continuously, and they read their contents in secret, while we find clear statements in *Shi'ite* sources claiming that only 'Ali (عليه السلام) was privileged to be in possession of the only and single complete copy of the Qur'an in addition to copies of the mentioned books (The Torah, the Psalms and the Gospels)? What would he need those books for, especially considering the fact that all of them were abrogated by the revelation of the Qur'an?

It is doubtless that Islam has no other book apart from the Qur'an, and canonizing more than a book and making it holy apart from the original is one of the features of the Jews and the Christians, as evident in their various books.

47 Why didn't the Prophet (ﷺ) slap his face when his son Ibrahim died, and why didn't 'Ali slap his face when Fatimah died?

70 See: *Usul al-Kafi* (1/227).

48 Most of the *Shi'ite mullahs*, especially in Iran, are ignorant of the Arabic language, as such, they lack the basic tool with which to exercise the work of the 'ulamah, that is, deducing the right rulings, based on clear understanding of the Qur'an and the *Sunnah*. The knowledge of Arabic language is a necessity for one to be a scholar.

49 The *Shi'ites* believe that most of the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) except a very few number, were hypocrites and unbelievers. If that was the case, why didn't those unbelievers destroy and wreck that small number that was with the Prophet (ﷺ)? If they argue that the companions only became apostates after the Prophet's death leaving only seven of them, why didn't they bring the whole message of the Prophet to an end by destroying the few number of Muslims left, thereby reverting the situation to what it was in the days of their forefathers?

50 Is it logically acceptable that the Prophet (ﷺ) failed woefully in choosing his companions, while Khomeini succeeded in that?

51 The *Shi'ite* scholar Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn al-Hasan al-Tusi says in the preface of his book '*Tahdhib al-Ahkam*'⁷¹, one of the four most reliable sources of Shi'i literature: 'All praise is due to Allah, The Most deserving to be praised. May His blessings be upon His chosen one and the best among His creation, Muhammad (ﷺ). A friend engaged me in a discussion about the narratives reported by our fellow *Shi'ites* – May Allah back and support them and have mercy on the dead among them -, and the incoherent disparities and

71 (1/45), and (1/2) Tehran edition, Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyyah, Tehran Bazar Sultani 1390 A.H.

irreconcilable contradictions found in them, to the extent that, you hardly find a narrative without finding another contradicting it. You hardly also find a *hadith* you assume to be free of any defect without having, on the opposite side, another that is totally incompatible with it. Nay, our opponents consider this the backbone of all reasons to condemn our *mazhab*, and on it they wholly capitalize in their effort to make null and void our basic beliefs...'⁷²

Another *Shi'ite* scholar, as-Sayyid Dildar 'Ali al-Luknowi, also said in his '*Asas al-Usul*'⁷³ that: 'The *hadiths* reported from the imams differ so greatly that you hardly find one *hadith* without having another that rejects what it confirms. And you hardly find a *hadith* believed to be compatible without finding another contradicting it, to the extent that some weak-minded *Shi'ites* retracted and left the *mazhab* for that reason...'

Stressing the fact mentioned by Al-Tusi, another celebrated *Shi'ite* scholar, Husain ibn Shihab al-Deen al-Karki, also mentioned in his '*Hidayat al-Abrar Ila Tariq Al-A'immatil Athar*'⁷⁴ that: 'That (i.e. the enormity of contradictions) was

72 Al-Tusi goes on to mention that it has been reported to him that some people he termed weak and unintelligent fled the Shi'i *mazhab*. He particularly mentioned the name of one who appears to be one of their scholars, Abu al-Husain al-Haruni al-'Alawi, who retracted from the Shi'i beliefs for his failure to reconcile between the many contradictory narratives upon which the *mazhab* was built. This is the irony of the matter, for one will find that most of the people leaving Shi'ism and reverting to the true teachings of Islam are among the Shi'ite mullahs not the common men. (Translator).

73 (p.51) printed in Lucknow, India.

74 (p.164) first ed. 1396 A.H.

the purpose he (Al-Tusi) mentioned in the beginning of his al-Tahdhib for compiling his book, that is, in order to dispel the contradictions contained in our narratives. That was at the time he learnt that some *Shi'ites* left the *mazhab* for that purpose'.

This is a clear-cut confession from reliable *Shi'ite* scholars about the inconsistencies and contradictions in their beliefs. Allah, The Most Exalted, speaking about the Qur'an⁷⁵ says:

["Then do they not reflect upon the Qur'an. If it had been from [anyone] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction."] (Surah An-Nisa: 82).

52 The *Shi'ites* claim that crying and wailing upon the death of al-Husain is a commendable act. Here we ask them, is this ruling based on any legal evidence or is it just based on your heretic whims? If it is based on any evidence, where and what is that evidence?

Moreover, why is it that none of the imams of *Ahl al-Bait* - whom you claim to follow - ever practiced that?

53 The *Shi'ites* believe that 'Ali ibn abi Talib was better than his son al-Husain (عليه السلام). If that is the case, why do they not mourn for him the way they do with respect to his son? Moreover, is the Prophet (ﷺ) not better than both of them? Why don't you mourn for him more than you do for the two?

75 In the original text: '...speaking about falsehood...'. The author means that the most common feature of falsehood is its contradictory nature, as against the truth. While in the mentioned verse Allah speaks about the Qur'an in that had it been from other than Allah, it would have been full of contradictions. (Translator).

54 If the so-called *imamate* of 'Ali ibn abi Talib and his progeny is truly a fundamental article of faith - and that whoever fails to believe and accept it is an unbeliever deserving to be punished in the Hell Fire, even if he declares the testament of faith that 'there is no deity worthy of worship but Allah and that Muhammad is His messenger', performs his daily prayers, gives out his due alms, fasts the month of Ramadan and performs the pilgrimage - as the *Shi'ites* believe, then why don't we find this fundamental article explicitly mentioned in the Qur'an?

We only find the Qur'an plainly mentioning other fundamentals and obligations that according to the *Shi'ites* are secondary, like the prayer, the *Zakat*, the fasting of the month of Ramadan and Hajj. Nay the Qur'an even mentions expressly some commonly lawful acts like hunting etc., but we don't have any trace whatsoever in the Qur'an of this so-called and falsely assumed most vital fundamental.

55 If the society of the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) was such as described by the *Shi'ites*: a society full of enmity between its populace; its members full of envy against each other; each and every one of them striving for nothing but political leadership; a society most members of which have become apostates and left the religion of Allah - if not for a very small number of them... If all this were true we wouldn't have witnessed Islam gaining ground and reaching the apogee of its strength and might, conquering various communities and bringing them under its umbrella and thousands of their populace accepting it as a religion, all in the days of the companions (*radiyallahu 'anhum*).

56 Why do most *Shi'ites* desert the Friday prayer which is explicitly stipulated in the Qur'an. Allah says:

"O you who have believed, when [the adhan] is called for the prayer on the day of Jumu'ah [Friday], then proceed to the remembrance of Allah and leave trade. That is better for you, if you only knew" (Surah Al-Jumu'ah: 9).

If they argue that they stay away from it until the advent of the Mahdi, we say: is waiting for the appearance of the Mahdi an excuse for not following this great obligation? For we find that hundreds of thousands or even more *Shi'ites* have died without performing the Friday prayer on this false and Satanic pretext.

57 The *Shi'ites* believe that some verses of the Qur'an were altered or removed by Abu Bakr and 'Umar (رضي الله عنه). They report from Abu Ja'far that someone said to him: 'Why was 'Ali called 'Amir al-Mu'minin' (Leader of the Faithful)? He said: "Allah named him that, and it was revealed in the Qur'an thus: *"And [mention] when your Lord took from the children of Adam from their loins – their descendants and made them testify of themselves, [saying to them], 'Am I not your Lord⁷⁶ and Muhammad My messenger and 'Ali the leader of the faithful?"*⁷⁷

76 To this point is the text of the Qur'an, Suratul A'raf: 172, but the statement: **'and Muhammad My messenger and 'Ali the leader of the faithful'** is added by the *Shi'ites*.

77 In the original text: '...speaking about falsehood...'. The author means that the most common feature of falsehood is its contradictory nature, as against the truth. While in the mentioned verse Allah speaks about the Qur'an in that had it been from other than Allah, it would have been full of contradictions. (Translator).

Al-Kulaini also says in explaining the meaning of the verse:

{ "So they who have believed in him } meaning the Imam {and honoured him, supported him and followed the light which was sent down with him – it is those who will be the successful"} (Surah al-A'raf: 157).

Meaning, those who have avoided *jibt* (sorcery) *taghut* (anything that is worshipped other than Allah) lest they worship it. *Jibt* and *taghut* are so-and-so, so-and-so and so-and-so".⁷⁸

The *Shi'ite* scholar al-Baqir al-Majlisi explained elsewhere that "The meaning of *fulan wa fulan* (so-and-so, and so-and-so) is Abu Bakr and 'Umar".⁷⁹

And that is why the *Shi'ites* consider them Satans – far be they from that!

It has been reported in their explanation of the verse:

{ "...do not follow the footsteps of Satan"} (Surah Al-Nur:21),

that they say: 'By Allah, the footsteps of Satan are *fulan* and *fulan* (so-and-so and so-and-so)'.⁸⁰

78 Ibid (*Usul al-Kafi* 1/429). In the original it is only "*fulan wa fulan*" (i.e. two unidentified people), but in the main source (*al-Kafi*, it is *fulan wa fulan wa fulan* (i.e. three people, meaning Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman. (Translator).

79 Bihar al-Anwar (23/306).

80 Tafsir al-'Ayyashi (1/214), (1/102 al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah al-Islamiyyah edi., Tehran, Suq Shiraz), and Tafsir as-Safi (1/242).

It is reported from Abu Abdullah that he said: [Whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger] on the issue of 'Ali's wilayah (leadership, caliphate...) and the Imams after him, [has certainly attained great attainment] He said: That is how it was revealed.⁸¹

And from Abu Ja'far, he said: "Gabriel descended with this verse on Muhammad thus:

*"How wretched is that for which they sold themselves – that they would disbelieve in what Allah has revealed} about 'Ali {through [their] outrage"} (Surah Al-Baqarah: 90).*⁸²

On the authority of Jabir, he said : Gabriel descended with this verse on Muhammad like this: *"And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down upon Our Servant"} about 'Ali {"then produce a surah the like therof"} (Surah Al-Baqarah: 23).*⁸³

They report once more from Abu Abdullah, he said: "Gabriel came down to Muhammad with this verse as follows: {O you who were given the Scripture, believe in what We have sent down} about 'Ali, a clear light".⁸⁴

81 This is their assumed explanation of the verse in Surah al-Ahzab: 71. See *Usul al-Kafi* (1/414). Emphases in bold are mine, to indicate the true words of the Qur'an, the rest being the Shi'ites' alterations of the verses.

82 Ibid (1/417).

83 Al-Mazandarani, *Sharh Usul al-Kafi* (7/66). Al-Mazandarani then maliciously commented: '...This indicates that the phrase: "*fi 'Aliyyin*" (about 'Ali) was part of the original order of the Qur'an'. (Translator).

84 Ibid (7/66).

On the authority of Muhammad ibn Sinan from Al-Rida, that he said, in his explanation of the verse: *"Difficult for those who associate others"* in the Wilayah of 'Ali *"is that to which you (O Muhammad) invite them"* (Surah Al-Shura: 13) about 'Ali's wilayah. That was how it was written in the Book".⁸⁵

Narrated from Abu Abdullah, that he said: *"{A supplicant asked for a punishment bound to happen. To the unbelievers} in the wilayah of 'Ali {of it there is no preventer} (Surah Al-Ma'arij 1-2). I swear by Allah, that was how Gabriel revealed it to Muhammad (ﷺ)".*⁸⁶

Narrated from Abu Ja'far, that he said: "Gabriel came down to Muhammad (ﷺ) with this verse thus: *{But those who wronged} (usurped) the household of Muhammad of their right {changed [those words] to a statement other than that which had been said to them, so We sent down upon those who wronged} (usurped) the household of Muhammad of their right {a punishment from the sky because they were defiantly disobeying} (Surah Al-Baqarah: 59)".*⁸⁷

From Abu Ja'far again, he said: "Gabriel came down to Muhammad (ﷺ) with this verse like this: *{Indeed, those who disbelieve⁸⁸ and commit wrong} i.e. usurped the right of Muhammad's household {never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a path. Except the path of Hell} (Surah*

85 Ibid (5/301), and al-Kulaini, *Usul al-Kafi* (1/417).

86 See: al-Kulaini, *Usul al-Kafi* (1/422).

87 Ibid (1/423-424).

88 The word (disbelieve) is missing in the original as well as in main source (*al-Kafi* (1/424).

Al-Nisa': 168-169).⁸⁹ He then said: {O Mankind, the Messenger has come to you with the truth from your Lord} about 'Ali's wilayah {so believe; it is better for you. But if you disbelieve} in the wilayah of 'Ali – {then indeed, to Allah belongs whatever is in the heavens and earth} (*Surah Al-Nisa': 170*)".⁸⁹

The *Shi'ites* believe that these verses were originally revealed as aforementioned and that they explicitly confirm the right of 'Ali to the wilayah and *imamah* immediately after the Prophet (ﷺ), but that Abu Bakr and 'Umar changed and altered the verses and removed any traces of the assumed evidences. Here we need to ask two important questions:

- ❑ So long as Abu Bakr and 'Umar have allegedly altered these verses, why didn't 'Ali expose that at the time he became the caliph of the Muslims, or at least return the verses to their original order in the Qur'an as 'revealed'?

He didn't do anything like that, rather the Qur'an throughout the caliphate of 'Ali remained as it was in the days of the three caliphs before him and the days of the Prophet (ﷺ) himself. That is because it has been under the special preservation and guardianship of Allah, The Most Exalted, who says:

{“Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e. the Qur'an] and indeed, We will be its guardian”} (Surah Al-Hijr: 9).

But the *Shi'ites* are heedless of this unavoidable fact.

89 Ibid (1/424)

- ❑ Some of these verses tampered with by the *Shi'ites* in their effort to assert the assumed eligibility of 'Ali to the caliphate before Abu Bakr and 'Umar, do expressly tell us that that will never happen.

For example, let us ponder on the verse that speaks about the Jews, the subject of which the *Shi'ites* diverted and claimed to refer to the Muslims, *{But those who wronged}* (usurped) the household of Muhammad of their right *{changed [those words] to a statement other than that which had been said to them, so We sent down upon those who wronged}* (usurped) the household of Muhammad of their right *{a punishment from the sky because they were defiantly disobeying}* (*Surah Al-Baqarah: 59*).

According to the *Shi'ites* this verse speaks about something that will happen at a future point in time and that 'Ali (عليه السلام) was fully aware of that. If this is the case, then why would 'Ali and the *Ahl al-Bait* demand a right assumed to have been usurped from them while the Qur'an is telling them that that usurpation is yet to occur, and that the Muslims will never accept 'Ali's wilayah or his being the legatee to the mandate of the caliphate, nor would he ever become the caliph immediately after the Prophet (ﷺ)?

Then we ask another question, when did the mentioned punishment occur on those who oppressed the household of Muhammad (ﷺ) and deprived them of their right to the caliphate?

Everybody is quite aware that it has never happened, and no one can trace that in the annals of history. Rather it is the

sheer alteration of the Qur'an, engineered so unintelligently that no one but the deceived can fail to see.

58 The *Shi'ites* report from Abu al-Hasan in his explanation of the verse: {They want to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths}, that he said: "They want to extinguish the wilayah of Amir al-Mu'minin", *{but Allah will perfect His light}* (*Surah Al-Saff: 8*), "but Allah will perfect the imamah. The *imamah* is the light, and that is the meaning of the verse: *{So believe in Allah and His Messenger and the light which We have sent down}* (*Surah Al-Taghabun: 8*). He said: "The light here, I swear by Allah, is nothing but the imams from the household of Muhammad (ﷺ) on the day of Judgement".⁹⁰

One is compelled here to ask: Did Allah perfect his light by spreading Islam or by giving the wilayah and the caliphate to the *Ahl al-Bait*?

59 We have only witnessed two of the so-called imams to have ascended to the throne of practical political leadership: 'Ali ibn abi Talib and his son al-Hasan (ﷺ). Where then is the claim of perfecting the light in the case of the other ten?⁹¹

60 Some Shi'i sources report from Ja'far al-Sadiq that one day a woman came and asked him whether it is permissible for her to express her loyalty to Abu Bakr and 'Umar? He said to her: "Be loyal to them". She said: 'Should I say to my

90 Ibid (1/139, 432).

91 Or will someone claim that Allah has failed to make realizable that fundamental article of faith, which one is considered an unbeliever if he dare denies it to one of the twelve imams, and which Allah promised the imams in the aforementioned 'verses'? *Subbanallah* (Translator).

Lord on the day of Judgement that you commanded me to be loyal to them?' He said: "Yes".⁹²

They also report that a man among the companions of al-Baqir was astonished when he heard al-Baqir describing Abu Bakr (ؓ) as al-Siddiq, and he said to him: 'Do you call him al-Siddiq?' Al-Baqir said: "Of course, al-Siddiq he is, and may Allah, on the day of Judgement, not accept the statement of whoever does not address him so".⁹³

What is the *Shi'ites'* opinion about Abu Bakr (ؓ)?.⁹⁴

92 Al-Kulaini, *Raudat al-Kafi* (8/101).

93 Al-Arbali, *Kashf al-Ghummah Fi Ma'rifat al-A'imma* (2/360). The author here somewhat summarized the narrative. In the original source, the man questioning the imam was asking whether it is permissible to decorate swords. Al-Baqir said: "There is nothing bad in that, because Abu Bakr as-Siddiq also used to decorate his sword". The man said: 'Do you call him as-Siddiq?'. Al-Baqir jumped to his feet and faced the Qiblah and said: Yes, as-Siddiq, Yes, as-Siddiq, Yes, as-Siddiq!!! May Allah, on the day of Judgement, not accept the statement of whoever does not address him so ".It is clear from the narrative that al-Baqir not only attested to the fact that a Muslim must address those pious companions of the Prophet with respect, especially the best of them Abu Bakr, and that he must be addressed with the epithet given him by the Prophet (ﷺ) himself, that is, as-Siddiq. Furthermore, al-Baqir also used to regard the actions of the companions as models to be emulated, as is evident clearly from this narrative when he stressed his opinion on decorating swords with the fact that Abu Bakr used to do that, just like someone will use the Qur'an or the *Sunnah* as proofs. (Translator).

94 That is, in marked contrast to the stance of their imam Muhammad ibn 'Ali ibn al-Husain (al-Baqir).

61 The *Shi'ite* scholars, Abu al-Faraj al-Asfahani in his 'Maqalat at-Talibiyyin',⁹⁵ al-Arbali in his 'Kashf al-Ghummah'⁹⁶ and al-Majlisi in his 'Jala' al-'Uyun',⁹⁷ all mentioned that Abu Bakr the son of 'Ali ibn abi Talib (عليه السلام) was also killed at Karbala together with his brother al-Husain (عليه السلام). Also killed on that day was the son of al-Husain himself and his name was Abu Bakr, (together with another son of 'Ali, Muhammad al-Asghar, also nick-named Abu Bakr).

Why do the *Shi'ites* conceal this matter and only concentrate on the issue of al-Husain?

The most apparent reason behind that is surely the fact that al-Husain's brother and son were both bearing the name Abu Bakr! And this is something the *Shi'ites* would not like the Muslims or their gullible followers to know, because that will expose their deceit and lie in claiming that there was bitter enmity between the *Ahl al-Bait* and the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ), more especially Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه). For, had he been an unbeliever and apostate who usurped the right of the caliphate from 'Ali and his progeny – as claimed by the *Shi'ites* – the *Ahl al-Bait* wouldn't have named their beloved sons with his noble name. Rather, this is a sign of strong and enduring love, recognizable by anyone who reasons.

Moreover, why would the *Shi'ites* not emulate the good example of 'Ali and al-Husain (عليه السلام) by naming their sons Abu Bakr?

95 (p.88; 142; 188) Beirut edition.

96 (2/66).

97 (p.582).

62 The belief in the Messenger of Allah Muhammad (ﷺ), and that he was the seal and last of all Prophets and Messengers of Allah, during and after his life time, is in itself enough to achieve all the aims and purposes for which an imam is appointed.

If we accept that whoever believes in Muhammad (ﷺ) as the Messenger of Allah and believes in the fact that obeying him is an incumbent duty on every Muslim and exerts his best effort possible in following the teachings and commands of the Messenger, he will be entitled to the blessed abode of Paradise, then we must accept that entering Paradise is achievable without the belief in the issue of *imamah*, and that one would not be answerable to Allah with regards to obeying anyone other than His Messenger.

But if it is said that one will not enter Paradise without obeying an imam, then this is in clear contradiction with various texts of the Qur'an, because Allah, the Most Exalted, has guaranteed entering Paradise to anyone who obeys Allah and His Messenger, and nowhere in the Qur'an did Allah make obeying an imam, in itself, or the mere belief in him a condition for that.

Allah says:

{ "And Whoever obeys Allah and the Messenger – those will be with the ones upon whom Allah has bestowed favour of the prophets, the steadfast affirmers of truth, the martyrs and the righteous. And excellent are those as companions." } (Surah An-Nisa': 69).

And He says:

{ "And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger will be admitted by Him to gardens [in Paradise] under which rivers flow, abiding eternally therein, and that is the great attainment" } (Surah An-Nisa': 13).

Had the *Imamate* been a fundamental aspect of faith or of disbelief, or the most essential and necessary foundation of the religion of Islam without which Allah will not accept from the servant any deed – as believed by the *Shi'ites* - Allah would have mentioned it in the aforementioned verses and stressed on it. That is because He knew before hand that the ummah will come to be divided on that particular issue.

I do not expect that someone will boldly argue that the issue of *imamah* has been alluded to in the verses implicitly under the general inference of obeying Allah and obeying the Messenger, for this is a sheer aberration in the art of the exegesis of the Qur'an. To refute this explanation, it suffices to say that obeying the Messenger is, in itself obeying the Lord who sent him, only that Allah did not mention obedience to Him alone thereby making obedience to the Messenger tacitly comprised in His obedience, rather He made the two independent side by side, in order to emphasize on two essential fundamentals of the Islamic faith (i.e. obedience to Allah and obedience to the Messenger). But it is only necessary to mention obedience to the Messenger after that of Allah as a condition to earning Paradise because the Messenger is an informer conveying Allah's message, and because obeying him is also, in the actual sense, obeying the One who sent him.

Considering the fact that no one after the Messenger (ﷺ) is believed to be acting in the position of conveying any message from and on behalf of Allah, we find that Allah attaches success in the hereafter and earning the abode of Paradise to obeying His Messenger and adhering to his teachings and not the teachings and commands of any other person.

63 In the days of the Prophet (ﷺ) there were people from remote areas who were able to come and meet him only once in their life time. They must not have heard – undoubtedly – anything to do with the wilayah or caliphate of 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and his sons and grandsons (عليه السلام).

The question here is, do we consider these people's Islam to be defective and incomplete?

If the *Shi'ites* will answer in the affirmative, one may assert that, if this is true then the Prophet (ﷺ) was in a better position than anyone else to correct and make their Islam right by explaining to them the doctrine of the so-called *imamate*, and this, he did not.

64 In '*Nahj Al-Balagha*', one of the sources most respected by the *Shi'ites*, the author reports the following narrative:

'In one of his ('Ali's) exchanges with Mu'wiyah, he wrote: "I was given allegiance by the same people who pledged their allegiance to Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman and on the same conditions on which they accepted them. He who was present had no right to choose otherwise, and he who was absent had no right to reject. It was nothing but *shura* (mutual deliberation) of the Muhajirun and the Ansar. So,

if they agreed on one person and called him an imam (a leader), that would be pleasing to Allah. If anyone revolts against their command by way of vilifying any of them or by way of introducing any innovation, they make him revert to his original status quo. If he becomes more arrogant and refuses to desist they fight him for going against the way of the faithful, and Allah will duly make him bear the consequences of what he sowed. O! Mu'awiyah, I swear that had you carefully looked into this matter with your plain reasoning rather than your whims, you would have come to the conclusion that I was the most innocent of all people of being responsible for killing 'Uthman, and you would have known that I was totally detached from anything to do with that, unless you want to incriminate, and you are free to do so as it pleases you. Peace".⁹⁸

It can be deduced from this:

- ❑ That the imam was chosen by the Muhajirun and Ansar, as such it has nothing to do with the *Shi'ite* fundamental of *imamate*;
- ❑ That the pledge of allegiance was given to 'Ali in the same mode in which Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman were given it;
- ❑ That the *shura* was the prerogative of the Muhajirun and Ansar. This is indicative of their high status in the sight of Allah, and is in stark contradiction with the picture given by the *Shi'ites* of them;

98 'Safwat Shuruh Nahj al-Balaghah, (p.593).

- ❑ The Muhajirun and Ansar's acceptance of someone to be their imam is within the bounds of Allah's pleasure. So, there was never any usurpation of the right of *imamate* as the *Shi'ites* claim, otherwise, how can Allah be pleased with such a thing?
- ❑ The *Shi'ites* curse Mu'awiyah, but we do not find 'Ali cursing him in the letters he wrote him.

65 The *Shi'ites* cannot deny the fact that Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman (may Allah be pleased with them) had given the Prophet (ﷺ) their pledge of allegiance under the tree (i.e. at Hudaibiyah), and that Allah had mentioned in the Qur'an that He was pleased with them and knew what was in their minds.⁹⁹ How unbecoming is it for the *Shi'ites*, after all this, to reject Allah's own view about these people and accept its opposite. It is as if they are saying to Allah: 'Our Lord, you do not know what we know about them' – God forbid.

66 While we find the *Shi'ites* cursing the most senior of the companions especially the three rightly-guided caliphs: Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman, and consider that curse to be a way of gaining Allah's pleasure, we don't find one single person among the followers of the *Sunnah* to have taken to that cause on any of the *Ahl al-Bait*. Rather all *Ahl as-Sunnah* seek Allah's pleasure and closeness through their love for *Ahl al-Bait*, and this is one thing none of the *Shi'ites* can deny, not even by their usual way of cheap slander.¹⁰⁰

99 Allah says: {*Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, [O Muhammad], under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquility upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest*} (*Al-Fath*: 18).

100 One can search through the vast Islamic literature, especially the

67 In their frequent discussions on the issue of the martyrdom of al-Husain, the *Shi'ites* assert that al-Husain died of intense thirst, and that is why you see them now writing on their water tanks the words: Drink water to remember the thirst of al-Husain.

One may ask here that so long as the *Shi'ites* believe that their imams have the knowledge of the unseen (*Ghaib*), was it not possible for al-Husain to foresee for himself the tragedy that was coming his way and that he would need some water during the battle, and that he would be dying of thirst, and as such he should have thought of collecting as much amount of water as to suffice him pass through the predicament?

Moreover, there is nothing wrong in saving water for unforeseen circumstances especially in battles, for it is one of the lawful means of achieving one's aim, and has nothing to do with losing trust in Allah. Allah, the Most Exalted, says:

"And prepare against them whatever you are able of power and of steeds of war by which you may terrify the enemy of Allah and your enemy." (Surah Al-Anfal: 60).

68 The deen of Islam was completed in the days of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), for Allah has clearly mentioned:

books of Aqa'id (Theology and ideological views), never will he find a single statement alluding to any sort of curse or vilification from the scholars of *Ahl as-Sunnah* toward any member of the Prophet's household (may Allah be pleased with them). But a mere glance through the main and most reliable Shi'i sources will unfold an enormous amount of narratives speaking ill of the sahabah. Nay, there are others in which they vilify even some of the *Ahl al-Bait* like al-Hasan ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib for ceding the caliphate in favour of Mu'awiyah, and others like 'Abdullah ibn Abbas and his father (may Allah be pleased with all). (Translator).

{*"This day I have perfected for you your religion."*}(*Surah Al-Ma'idah: 3*).

But the Shi'i *madhhab* only appeared after the death of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ).

69 Allah, The Most Exalted, has sent down verses on A'isha's innocence in the famous *ifk* incidence, and has declared her innocence from that reprehensible slander. But despite that the *Shi'ites* still accuse her of being guilty of betrayal¹⁰¹, Allah forbid. This, of course, is discrediting, not only to the Messenger, but to Allah, the Most Exalted, Who, despite His perfect knowledge of the unseen, did not tell his Prophet that his wife was cheating on him? Far be she from that.

What an evil *madhhab* is this that speaks ill of the wives of the best of all humans, and the mothers of the faithful?

70 If one is to believe and accept what the *Shi'ites* report in many narratives ascribing to 'Ali and his progeny (ﷺ) some miracles, and that the *Shi'ites* benefit from those miracles at the present time, i.e. after the death of those imams, then why couldn't the imams avail them anything at the time they were alive?

We do find in history that 'Ali could not gain full control over issues of the caliphate, and he was later on killed. We

101 See: Tafsir al-Qummi (2/377) in his explanation of the verse: {*Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot. They were under two of Our righteous servants but betrayed them*} [At-Tabrim: 10], Al-Qummi said: 'I swear by Allah, He means by the word: {but betrayed them} nothing but adultery, and that so-and-so be punished for what she committed on her way, because so-and-so was in love with her'. And see al-Bahrani's 'al-Burhan' (4/358).

also find al-Hasan with no choice but to cede the caliphate in favour of Mu'awiyah, al-Husain was oppressed then killed without achieving his aim...and that was the situation with those imams after them.

Where were all those miracles they were believed to have been endowed with?

71 The *Shi'ites* claim that reports (from the Prophet) on 'Ali's virtues and on his assumed *imamate* are in very large numbers via *Shi'ite* narrators.

It is imperative here to assert that the reports narrated by those who were not among the *sahabah* will never be authentic, for they never met or saw the Prophet (ﷺ), nor did they hear anything from him. So their reports from him must be part of what the scholars of *hadith* term *mursal* and *munqati'*. Those narratives will only be authentic if they report them through the *sahabah* and regard them the first authorities in that respect. And it is a known fact that the *sahabah* respected and loved by the *Shi'ites* are very little in number, to be more precise, they are a little more than ten, and this is below the required number for a report to be termed *mutawatir*.

On another side we find that the *Shi'ites* vilify the majority of the *sahabah* who reported the virtues of 'Ali, and accuse them of disbelief.

If the *Shi'ites* believe that it is probable that those *sahabah* who were praised by the Qur'an were liars and that they concealed some of the knowledge they knew concerning 'Ali's virtues or his purported *Imamate*, regardless of their

large number, they must also accept that probability in the case of those little number they respect and love. Nay, that probability in their case is even more in place and logical.

72 The *Shi'ites* claim that Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman were after nothing but political leadership and that they oppressed its eligible owners and usurped it from them.

Ironically, we find that none of those three caliphs ever fought a Muslim over the issue of the caliphate. Rather they only fought the apostates and the unbelievers. They were the ones who brought the end of the Persian dynasty, quashed the Byzantine empire and by that conquered their lands and peoples and made them lands of Islam and their peoples Muslims. They strengthened and fortified Islam and the Muslims, and debased disbelief and the unbelievers.

Rebels came to kill 'Uthman – who was surely lower in status than Abu Bakr and 'Umar-. But despite the fact that he was the incumbent and eligible caliph at the time, he did not fight any Muslim for that, nor did he kill one single Muslim in the name of preserving the caliphate to himself.

So, if the *Shi'ites* will strengthen the probability of those three being power-greedy and oppressors, they must also say the same in the case of 'Ali (ﷺ).¹⁰²

102 The point here is that in the days of 'Ali (ﷺ) fierce conflicts occurred over the caliphate itself, and a number of Muslims were killed in that cause, even though, no one among the scholars of *Ahl as-Sunnah* ever accused 'Ali (ﷺ) of being power-greedy. So, if the *Shi'ites* will accuse Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman in whose reign there were no conflict on the caliphate and no Muslim was killed, nor did they fight anyone to gain power, It would be very unfair to accuse them without accusing 'Ali (ﷺ) (Translator).

73 The *Qadiyanis* (*Ahmadiyyahs*) were declared unbelievers for their belief in another prophet after Muhammad (ﷺ), i.e. their leader Ghulam Ahmad. On the other hand, we find the *Shi'ites* ascribing to their Imams the special qualities that are particular to the Prophets. What difference is there between the *Shi'ites* and the *Qadiyanis* in this respect?

This is surely one of the things that lead people to disbelief, otherwise let them draw the demarcation line between a Prophet and an imam.

Did the Messenger (ﷺ) come to give us the tidings of twelve Imams who would be on the same status with him, their sayings carrying equal weight with his, their actions accepted as law like his, and being infallible like him?

74 How would the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) be buried in 'A'isha's room, while the *Shi'ites* believe that she was an unbeliever and a hypocrite? How could Allah then allow the clean and virtuous body of his beloved Prophet be buried in the room of an unbeliever? On the contrary, burying the Prophet there must be a sign of his love for her and his being pleased with her?

75 Again, how could the Messenger of Allah be buried between Abu Bakr and 'Umar who according to the *Shi'ites* were unbelievers? It is not lawful to bury a Muslim between unbelievers, and how bad if that Muslim is the Prophet (ﷺ) himself? This implies that Allah did not preserve His Prophet from the company of unbelievers even after his death.

Another important question here is, what was 'Ali's stance from all of this? Why didn't he oppose these 'dangerous' measures?

One of two options here must be true and the other false. Either that Abu Bakr and 'Umar were Muslims whom Allah had granted the honour of being close to the Prophet (ﷺ) for their status with Allah and His Messenger – and this is surely the truth-, or that 'Ali was deceitfully fawning on people at the expense of his religion¹⁰³ – far be he from that. Otherwise, how can the best of all people on earth, the esteemed Messenger of Allah, be buried only steps away from wrongdoers and unbelievers, as the *Shi'ites* would like us to believe?

76 The *Shi'ites* claim that explicit texts of the Qur'an in favour of 'Ali's *imamate* and his right to the caliphate (i.e. immediately after the Prophet) were revealed by Allah but the companions concealed them.

This is definitely devoid of an iota of truth, because we find that those companions did not conceal the various and numerous *hadiths* on the virtues of 'Ali (عليه السلام) which are used as proofs by the *Shi'ites* in their claim of his *imamate*.

103 That is, if 'Ali (عليه السلام) would allow Abu Bakr and 'Umar to be buried near the Prophet (ﷺ), having known perfectly that they were non-Muslims – as the *Shi'ites* claim – that will amount to his being an accomplice to harm the Prophet. And this is definitely what 'Ali never did. So, by allowing their bodies to be buried there, 'Ali must have believed them to be Muslims, nay the best of Muslims after the Prophet (ﷺ).

An example is the *hadith* in which the Prophet (ﷺ) said to him: "You are to me like Aaron was to Moses", and other *hadiths* of this nature. Why didn't the companions conceal these *hadiths*?

77 Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه) was the right and most eligible caliph after the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ). This is substantiated by a number of evidences, some of which are:

- ❑ The consensus of all the companions to obey and submit to his orders and without any opposition. Had he been an oppressor who usurped the right of the caliphate they wouldn't have left him without any revolt, nor would they have obeyed him, considering their steadfastness in religion and their fearlessness in taking action on anything in the name of Allah;
- ❑ 'Ali did not go against him nor did he fight him. And this stance from 'Ali must be for one of three reasons: one, either for fear of the occurrence of any civil strife in the Ummah; two, due to his weakness and inability to fight; three: for his perfect knowledge of the fact that Abu Bakr was the right caliph and on the right track.

To say that he did not fight for fear of trouble and *fitnah* within the Ummah is, to say the least, vain talk, because he fought Mu'awiyah and a lot of people were killed in the battles that ensued between them, just like he fought Talha, Zubair and 'A'isha (رضي الله عنها) at a time he was sure that the right of the caliphate was his, without fear of any strife.

It is also illogical to say that he did not fight due to weakness, because those who helped him in his battles against

Mu'awiyah were believers on the day of *Saqifah*, as well as on the day 'Umar was assigned by Abu Bakr to be his successor, and also on the day 'Umar, on his death bed, ordered six people to deliberate on choosing one of them as the caliph after him. Had they known that the right to the throne was his they would have helped him against Abu Bakr because, had there been the purported nass (explicit order from the Prophet that 'Ali should be the caliph immediately after him), Abu Bakr would have been more deserving to be fought than Mu'awiyah.¹⁰⁴

There is thus no other reason behind 'Ali's stance but his knowledge of the fact that the right to the caliphate was Abu Bakr's.

78 The *Shi'ites* claim that Mu'awiyah was an unbeliever and apostate. This is totally false, for if that was true then they must also accuse 'Ali and his son al-Hasan (عليه السلام).

That is because to believe in such false claim means that 'Ali was defeated by apostates and that al-Hasan had handed over the affairs of the Muslims to an apostate.

While on a different side, we find that Khalid ibn al-Walid fought the apostates in the reign of Abu Bakr and gained victory over them. This means that Allah's help for Khalid against the unbelievers was greater and more effective than His help for 'Ali's cause. And considering the fact that Allah is just and does not wrong anybody, one is made to deduce from this that Khalid was better than 'Ali, for Allah had helped him against the apostates while He did not help 'Ali

104 Who fought for the blood of his kin 'Uthman bin 'Affan (عليه السلام).

against those whom the *Shi'ites* consider apostates. Above all that, one is also made to believe that Allah made victorious the armies of Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman but left 'Ali so weak that he couldn't overcome the apostates.

Moreover, Allah says in the Qur'an:

{ "So do not weaken and do not grieve, and you will be superior if you are [true] believers." } (Surah Al-'Imran: 139),

and He says:

{ "So do not weaken and call for peace while you are superior; and Allah is with you and will never deprive you of [the reward of] your deeds." } (Surah Muhammad: 35).

Despite this we find 'Ali, ultimately, calling Mu'awiyah to a truce, that is when he felt he was so weak that he couldn't drive him away from his territory, and demanded that both of them should remain in their present status. So, if 'Ali's companions were Muslims and their opponents apostates – as believed by the *Shi'ites* – his companions must necessarily be the most superior and victorious, and this is surely not what happened.

79 To defend 'Ali (عليه السلام) from the charges labeled against him by the *Kharijites* that he was an unbeliever and unjust ruler, the *Shi'ites* will never be successful except if they follow the path of the *Ahl as-Sunnah*. That is because if the *Kharijites* say: we do not accept that he was a believer, but was rather an infidel and a wrongdoer – just like the *Shi'ites* say in respect of Abu Bakr and 'Umar -, the *Shi'ites* cannot produce evidence to prove that 'Ali was actually a believer and a just ruler except

that evidence is indicative, in a more deserving manner, of the faith of Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman.

If they bring as evidence the famous reports about 'Ali's early acceptance of Islam, his migration to Madina and his participation in battles with the Prophet (ﷺ), then this has similarly been reported in respect of those three. Nay, reports about the acceptance of Islam in respect of Mu'awiyah and the Umayyad and 'Abbasid caliphs are also enormous, as well as about their prayer, fasting and jihad against the unbelievers. All these are reported through authentic channels.

So, if they claim that one of those three caliphs (Abu Bakr 'Umar and 'Uthman) was a hypocrite, the *Kharijites* also find it easy to have the same claim on 'Ali. And whatever thing they may regard to be evidence in their favour, a more deserving response should be used to counter it.

If they further resort to slander by saying that Abu Bakr and 'Umar were hypocrites and were secretly enemies of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), and that they have done all they could to distort and corrupt his religion, the *Kharijites* can also say the same in respect of 'Ali. They will claim that he was envious of his cousin, had bitter enmity towards him, that he wanted to corrupt his religion, and that he had plans that he couldn't execute during the lifetime of the Prophet himself or the lives of the three rightly guided caliphs. But during the reign of the third caliph he had the right opportunity when he tried to kill him and, consequently he caused terrible strife and conflict within the Ummah, in which a great number of the companions of Muhammad were killed, all out of his hatred and enmity towards the Prophet. The *Kharijites* may also claim that Ali was secretly in agreement with those who

defied him or believed him to be a prophet, and that he was only pretending hypocritically to show that he was with the mainstream Muslims out of sheer *taqiyyah*. And that is why the *Batinis* were among his followers and they claim that they own his inner secrets and that the so-called *batini* ideology they hold originated from him.¹⁰⁵

If the *Shi'ites* will again try to affirm 'Ali's faith and his being just by claiming that the Qur'an has mentioned him explicitly, they should be made to know that the Qur'an is general in its nature, and its treatment of all believers is based on an equal level depending on the meaning of the general term that is used. For example, the term *mu'minun* refers to all those who believe, the term *muhajirun* covers all the individuals, men and women who migrated from Makkah to Madina at the time of the Prophet, etc. So one has no right to claim that a particular verse is referring to one individual – 'Ali or any other person – only, so long as there is no explicit mention of his name. Therefore, any verse the *Shi'ites* claim to be referring to 'Ali in particular may be used by some other person to claim that it – or another more greater verse - actually refers to Abu Bakr and 'Umar. Unsubstantiated claims without proof and evidence could be concocted by anyone, moreover, claims in favour of the virtues of Abu Bakr and 'Umar are easier and more possible than in favour of any of the other *sahabah*.

But if they claim that his faith has been reported in many narratives, they should know that narratives in favour of those three caliphs are greater in number and are more popular. If they claim that the narratives on 'Ali are sound

105 See: Ibn 'Taimiyyah, '*Minhaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyyah*' vol.2 p.62-64

and authentic and reached the level of *tawatur*, we say that the *tawatur* in respect of the narratives concerning Abu Bakr, and 'Umar is more sound and effective. And if they insist that it was the *sahabah* who reported 'Ali's virtues, it is said to them that the reports of the *sahabah* in favour of Abu Bakr and 'Umar are greater in number.¹⁰⁶

106 The author here follows the method used by Ibn 'Taimiyah in his *Minhaj as-Sunnah*. It is important that the reader should carefully read between the lines in order to grasp the main import of the argument. Sentiments should be kept aside. Neither Ibn 'Taimiyah nor our author here endorses the arguments of the Kharijites against 'Ali (عليه السلام). It is rather a simple logical hypothesis to call the *Shi'ites* to reason and see the gravity of vilifying and defaming the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ), more especially Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman. None of them, including 'Ali, was infallible. So, if the *Shi'ites* will defame or rather condemn them to apostasy and unbelief ignoring their esteemed status with Allah and His Prophet, and the fact that the verses of the Qur'an that touch on their position and virtues did not mention any of them by name, but cover them all in a general manner by using terms that apply to either all the faithful at the time of revelation, or some of them for a specific reason or quality. To claim that these verses only apply to one of them as against the rest is devoid of any substance. And this is the bone of contention between the *Shi'ites* and the Muslim Ummah, for they accuse Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman of *kufir* and apostasy despite the fact that the verses of the Qur'an and the *hadiths* of the Prophet that attest to the fact that all of them including 'Ali, were faithful and sincere companions of the Prophet, were one and the same. All of them were faithful Muslims, nay they were the best of the whole Ummah after the Prophet (ﷺ). On another side we find the unfair and false accusation of the *Khawarij* who rebelled against 'Ali and declared him an unbeliever for accepting the arbitration that occurred between his party and that of Mu'awiyah. To refute this false slander against 'Ali it is necessary for one to use the same verses of the Qur'an and the *hadiths* of the Prophet and narratives in the *sirah* and history of the Prophet and the rightly guided caliphs after him which speak voluminously about the faith and uprightness of all of the companions of the Prophet. *Shi'ite* reports contained in Shi'i sources alone cannot be of any help. And it is a known fact that the verses of the Qur'an and *hadiths* of the Prophet do not refer to 'Ali alone without Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman (عليه السلام). (Translator).

80 The *Shi'ites* believe that 'Ali was the most eligible for the caliphate for their assumption that his virtues surpass that all of the companions and that the narratives to that effect are greater in number than those reported in respect of other companions.

Granted it is true that 'Ali's virtues are more than that of Mu'awiyah, like his early acceptance of Islam, his *jihad* with the Messenger, his vast knowledge, his steadfastness and asceticism, is that true with al-Hasan and al-Husain over the likes of Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas, 'Abd Ar-Rahman ibn 'Auf, 'Abd Allah ibn 'Umar and others among the Muhajirun and Ansar? This is something nobody can claim in respect of them. So there remains for them nothing to resort to but the false claim of *nass* (clear texts of the Qur'an or *hadith*) on each of them. Making claims and false interpretations for one's own interests is something that everyone is capable of doing.

Would the Umayyads allow for themselves to lie and falsely claim the *nass* in respect of Mu'awiyah, they would have a stronger case than the *Shi'ites*, because Allah, The Most Exalted, says:

{ "And whoever is killed unjustly – We have given his heir authority, but let him not exceed limits in [the matter of] taking life. Indeed, he has been supported [by the law]" } (Surah Al-Isra': 33).

They would therefore say: the one killed unjustly was 'Uthman ibn 'Affan, and Allah had supported Mu'awiyah for being the avenger of his blood.

81 The *Shi'ites* claim that Abu Bakr and 'Umar had usurped the caliphate from 'Ali and conspired against him in order to prevent him from having a hold on it...and other charges.

If this claim were true why did 'Umar put him among the six members of the *Shura* he delegated to deliberate on choosing the caliph? Had he removed him the way he removed Sa'id ibn Zaid or had he appointed some other person in his place, no one could have opposed his opinion.

Therefore the unavoidable fact is that the companions surely placed 'Ali in the right and relevant position he belonged to, without exceeding limits or negligence in that respect, may Allah be pleased with all of them. They have also given their pledge to the rightly guided caliphs in their relevant and respective orders, beginning with the best, followed by the best etc, thereby putting 'Ali in his most deserved class.

One thing to buttress this fact is that when 'Ali ascended the throne after the martyrdom of 'Uthman, the Muhajirun and Ansar wasted no time before pledging their allegiance in respect of the caliphate to 'Ali and none of them ever apologized to him for their acceptance of Abu Bakr, then 'Umar and 'Uthman before him. No one on this earth could claim that such a thing occurred from those pious *sahabah*. Or did anyone of them ever repent for his rejection of a *nass* on 'Ali's leadership, or did anyone of them ever mention that he remembered a *nass* he happened to forget in favour of 'Ali's *Imamate*?

82 On the day of *Saqifah* the Ansar contested accepting Abu Bakr as caliph at the initial stage, and called upon everyone to vest Sa'd ibn Ubadah with the post. 'Ali, on the other

side, stayed indoor, neither inclining to this nor to the other group. But in the end the whole of the Muhajirun and Ansar agreed on Abu Bakr (may Allah be pleased with all).

This action from the Ansar in particular, i.e. changing their minds to accept Abu Bakr must be for one of three reasons:

- ☐ That they had been coerced into accepting Abu Bakr;
- ☐ That Abu Bakr's right and eligibility to the post emerged so clearly that they had to submit;
- ☐ That they took that action without any specific reason.

No fourth reason can be thought of here.

So, if the *Shi'ites* will say that the Ansar were forced to give their pledge, one would necessarily reject that, for it is a sheer lie. Because there was never a battle between the people at *Saqifah*, nor was there any physical combat or exchange of abuses or threats, and neither was anyone armed. Moreover, it was not possible for the Ansar to be terrorized inside their own home and considering their large population of more than two thousand strong warriors, all from one single clan well known for their bravery, so much so that everyone was weary of launching any attack on them. That is because they had gone through an eight-year war against almost all Arab clans in their surroundings, resulting in them not being afraid of death. Above all that their minds were fresh with their experience in the just concluded war against the Romans in the battle of Mu'tah. It was therefore totally impossible for such people to fear Abu Bakr and just two other men with him,

especially considering that Abu Bakr was not from a strong clan, nor did he own many slaves or have strong relatives or wealth. So how could they return to him while compared to them he was of no value. But all the same they accepted him and pledged their allegiance to him wholeheartedly.

It is likewise false to assume that the Ansar rescinded their former decision of vesting one of their kinsfolk with the caliphate while they believe that it was their eligible right to claim so, just for nothing. It is also impossible for the differing inclinations of that large number of the Ansar to agree on something they knew was wrong and void without being forced by fear or intimidation, and without being influenced by their vested interests to acquire some wealth or reputation. How could they wholly sacrifice all that to a man who had neither strong relatives to support him, nor any power or security operatives to guard him, nor had he any palace which he took to be a fortress against any attack, nor strong slaves or wealth and influence with which to acquire whatever he liked and usurp whatever power from whomever he wished.

So, if all the above assumptions are false, nothing then remains but the fact that the Ansar only changed their minds and accepted Abu Bakr (ؓ) for a very strong and authentic proof from the Prophet (ﷺ), not for a personal *ijtihad* or a simple assumption like their own.

Having made void the assumption that the Ansar were the right heirs to the throne and the caliphate had slipped from their hands, the question then is, what made all of them agree on denying the purported explicit statement of the Prophet

(ﷺ) that 'Ali would be the imam after him immediately?¹⁰⁷. It is surely impossible for the views of all of them to agree on helping the same person (i.e. Abu Bakr) that wronged and usurped them of their right, against 'Ali (*may Allah be pleased with all of them*).

83 So long as Abu Bakr and 'Umar had succeeded in brushing 'Ali aside from the caliphate – as the *Shi'ites* assume – what worldly gain did they achieve for themselves?

Why didn't Abu Bakr assign one of his sons as heir to the throne after him as 'Ali did? Why didn't 'Umar leave the caliphate to one of his sons as 'Ali did?

84 We do find in history that the mother of Muhammad the son of 'Abdullah ibn 'Amr ibn 'Uthman ibn 'Affan was Fatimah the daughter of al-Husain ibn 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (ﷺ). So his grandmother was Fatimah the daughter of the Prophet (ﷺ) and his grandfather was 'Uthman (ﷺ).

The *Shi'ites* now need to answer this embarrassing question. Would it be acceptable to them that one of Fatimah's grandsons is among the cursed? That is because according to the *Shi'ites*, the whole of the Umayyads – the aforementioned Muhammad inclusive – are meant by the phrase:

107 That is, if there was really any nass, why did the Ansar who had just lost the caliphate to Abu Bakr, having known that the Prophet had plainly mentioned the name of 'Ali as the Imam after him, agree on shutting their mouths on reminding Abu Bakr of the Prophet's statement, or how could they have connived with Abu Bakr who had just usurped the caliphate from them, to deny 'Ali his right? (Translator).

{ "...the accursed tree [mentioned] in the Qur'an." } (*Surah Al-Isra': 60*).¹⁰⁸

85 The *Shi'ites* have joined in their imams two contradicting features: Infallibility and *taqiyyah* (*Shi'ite* practice of dissimulation – to disguise or hide true feelings, thoughts or intentions). The point is that, what benefit is there in the assumed infallibility of those imams if the *Shi'ites* are not able to ascertain whether the imams had really and truly spoken their minds in all their statements and whether their actions were always in agreement with their intentions taking into account the probability of them practising *taqiyyah*? This is because the practice of *taqiyyah* is considered so integral to the Shi'i faith that they claim it amounts to ninety percent of the entire religion.

So long as they accord this practice the same position as the five daily prayers by their statement: "Whoever leaves practicing *taqiyyah* is like one who leaves the prayers"¹⁰⁹, and that: "*taqiyyah* is nine-tenth of the religion"¹¹⁰, it is undoubtedly known that the imams had practiced all of this so-called nine-tenth of the religion, and this is surely in stark contrast to their assumed infallibility.

108 See: al-Kulaini, '*al-Kafi*' (5/7), and the Book of Salim ibn Qais (p.362).

109 Al-Majlisi, '*Bihar al-Anwar*' (75/421), an-Nuri at-Tabrasi '*Mustadrak al-Wasa'il*' (12/254). The wording in *Mustadrak al-Wasa'il* is: "If I would say that whoever leaves *taqiyyah* is like him who leaves prayer, I would be right". (Translator).

110 Al-Kulaini, '*Usul al-Kafi*' (2/217), and al-Majlisi '*Bihar al-Anwar*' (75/423).

86 The *Shi'ites* contradict themselves by using the hadith of ath-Thaqalain¹¹¹ for we find that they consider whoever defiles and speaks ill of the smaller of the two burdens, that is the *Ahl al-Bait*, to be unbelievers, but he who defiles the greater one, that is the Qur'an is merely seen by them to have 'made a mistake', and does not become an unbeliever.

87 The *Shi'ites* assume that all of the Prophet's companions were apostates but a few, not more than seven.

The question is, what of the rest of the *Ahl al-Bait* like the progeny of Ja'far and those of 'Ali (عليه السلام)? Were they also apostates?

88 In the famous *hadith* of the Mahdi (according to the *Sunnah*), the Prophet (ﷺ) is reported to have said: "Even if nothing remains before the Hereafter but a single day, Allah would surely make it long for Him to send a man from my own household, whose name will be exactly like mine, and his father's name will also be exactly like my father's name".¹¹²

The Prophet's name, as is undoubtedly known, is Muhammad the son of Abdullah, while the *Shi'ites'* assumed Mahdi is named Muhammad the son of al-Hasan. This is surely a serious problem.

111 The word *thaqalain* means the two heavy burdens (the Qur'an and *Ahl al-Bait*) that were mentioned in the hadith: "I will leave within you the two heavy things: the Book of Allah and my progeny, my household" (Reported by Tirmidhi (5/328-329).

112 Reported by Abu Dawud (4/106), and considered authentic by Albani (See: 'Sahih al-Jami', hadith No.(5180).

That is why one *Shi'ite mullah*, in his effort to solve the problem, gave a ridiculous answer, saying: 'The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) had two grand children: Abu Muhammad al-Hasan and Abu 'Abdullah al-Husain. The Prophet (ﷺ), knowing that the awaited Mahdi would come from the progeny of al-Husain whose *kunyah* (patronym) happened to be Abu 'Abdullah, designated the *kunyah* as name in order to make it (the *kunyah*) correspond with the name of his own father (Abdullah) and thereby calling the grandfather with the word 'father'.¹¹³

89 Some contradictions on the issue of the *Shi'ite* Mahdi.

☐ Who was the Mahdi's mother?

Was she a maid named Narjis, or a maid called Suqail or another called Mulaikah, or yet another called Khamt, or the one named Hukaimah/Hakimah, or Raihanah or Susan, or was she a free-born woman called Maryam?

☐ When was the assumed Mahdi born?

Was he born eight months after his father's death, as some narratives put it, or before his father's death in the year 252 A.H., or was it in the year 255, or 256, or 257 or 258. Or was it on the 8th of the month of Dhul Qa'dah or the 8th of Sha'ban or the 15th of Sha'ban or the 15th of Ramadan?

☐ The Method of His Conception

Did his mother conceive him in her womb naturally like all women, or was it in her waist unlike all women?

113 Al-Arbali 'Kash al-Ghummah Fi Ma'rifat al-A'immah' (3/228).

❑ **His Mode of Delivery?**

Was his delivery through the normal way or through the thigh of his mother?

❑ **The Physical Growth of His Body**

They report from Abul Hasan that he said: "The physical growth of the body of one of us, the Ausiya (legatees to the Imamah), in a day is like the growth of the bodies of some other people in a week".

They also report from Abul Hasan that he said: "A one month old child among us is like a year old child in other than us".

In another report Abul Hasan said: "The growth of one of us (imams) in a day is like the growth of one among other people in a year".¹¹⁴

❑ **Where is he?**

In some narratives they say he lives in Taibah (Madina), but in some they say, no, he lives in a cave on a mountain called Radwa in the area of Ar-Rauha'. In some others they assert that he is presently in Makkah in the place called Dhu Tuwa, and somewhere else they say he is in the city of Samurra' in Iraq.

Someone even said in a piece of poetry, "May I know in what destination you are? ...Or which part of the earth carries you? Are you in Radwa or somewhere else, or in

114 See: al-Tusi, 'al-Ghaibah' (p.159-160).

Dhu Tuwa... Or in Yemen, in the valley of Shamrukh, or else on the Green Island?"¹¹⁵

❑ **Would he return as a young man or as an ageing old man?**

On the authority of al-Mufaddal: 'I asked As-Sadiq, saying, 'My Master, would he (the Mahdi) appear in the form of a young man or in old age?' He said: "Glory be to Allah! How could one know that? He would rather appear in whatever form he so wishes".¹¹⁶

In another narrative, "He will appear in the form of a young man of thirty-two years of age".¹¹⁷

In yet another, "He will appear in the form of a fifty-one year old man".¹¹⁸

And in another narrative, "He will appear in the form of a young man of thirty years".¹¹⁹

❑ **The Span of his Reign**

Muhammad as-Sadr says, "There are a lot of narratives to this effect but all of them are so contradictory in meaning that many writers on the topic are in total

115 Al-Majlisi, 'Bihar al-Anwar (102/108)

116 Ibid, (53/7).

117 Tarikh Ma Ba'd al-Zuhur (p.360).

118 Ibid, (p.361).

119 At-Tusi, 'Kitab al-Ghaibah' (p.420).

confusion as to the right opinion".¹²⁰

It is said that "The reign of the Mahdi is nineteen years", and in another narrative: "It is seven years, but Allah will elongate his days and nights so much so that a year of his would be equal to ten years, as such, the span of his reign would be seventy of your normal years".

It is also reported that his reign will be for three hundred and nine years, that is equal to the number of years the people of the cave lived in their cave.

❑ The Span of his Disappearance

They report from 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام) that he said: "The Mahdi would disappear and his case will be of much confusion that many people would be astray and some be on the right path". When he was asked for how long would the confusion last, he said: "For six days or six months or six years".¹²¹

It is reported from Abu 'Abdullah that he said: "The period between the appearance of the Mahdi and the murder of an-Nafs az-Zakiyyah is but fifteen nights", that is in the year one hundred and forty after the *Hijrah*.

Muhammad as-Sadr commented on this narrative, saying, "This is an authentic narrative, ascertainable historically, according to the laid down rules of this book. The narrative has been reported by al-Mufid in his '*al-Irshad*', on the authority of Tha'labah ibn Maimun from Shu'aib al-Haddad from Salih ibn Maitam al-

120 Tarikh Ma Ba'd al-Zuhur (p.433).

121 Al-Kulaini, '*al-Kafi*' (1/338).

Jammal, and all of these people are great and reliable".¹²² But seeing that the assumed Mahdi did not appear at the stated time in this narrative, another narrative was supposed to have been reported from him, saying: "O Thabit, Allah had fixed the time of the appearance of the Mahdi to be in the year seventy, but when al-Husain was killed Allah became so much annoyed with all the people on earth that he deferred his appearance to the year one hundred and forty. And we have told you that he would appear in the year one hundred and forty, but unfortunately you made that precious information public and exposed the secret, and as a result of that Allah did not appoint any other time for it as far as we know".¹²³

All this notwithstanding we find a narrative denying and rejecting all the aforementioned opinions. Reported from Abu Abdullah Ja'far as-Sadiq that he said: "Those who appoint a fixed time (for the appearance of the Mahdi) have surely lied. We, the *Ahl al-Bait*, do not assume any fixed time".¹²⁴

In another report he said: "We did not fix a time in the past, nor would we fix it in the future".¹²⁵

90 The *Shi'ites* report from 'Ali (عليه السلام) that one day, when he came out in a furious manner and met his companions, he said to

122 Tarikh Ma Ba'd al-Zuhur (p.185).

123 Al-Kulaini, '*Usul al-Kafi*' (1/368), an-Nu'mani '*al-Ghaibah*' (p.197), at-Tusi, '*al-Ghaibah*' (p.263), and al-Majlisi '*Bihar al-Anwar*' (52/117).

124 Al-Kulaini, '*Usul al-Kafi*' (1/368), and an-Nu'mani '*al-Ghaibah*' (p.198).

125 At-Tusi, '*al-Ghaibah*' (p.262) and al-Majlisi '*Bihar al-Anwar*' (52/103).

them: "What would you do at a time when the *hadd* (legal punishments) is neglected, favouritism in terms of wealth is rampant, and animosity is waged against Allah's pious servants, and Allah's enemies are loved?" They said, 'O leader of the faithful, what would you advise us to do if we find ourselves in such a situation?' He said, "Be like the companions of Jesus (ﷺ), for some of them were torn apart with saws, and some were crucified. Dying in the cause of obedience to Allah is better than living in sin".¹²⁶

'Ali's position here stands in total contrast to the *Shi'ites'* practice of *taqiyyah*.

91 What was it that forced or persuaded Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه) to follow the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) when he migrated from Makkah to Madina? How could he have followed him if he were a hypocrite as the *Shi'ites* falsely believe? And how could he have run away from his unbelieving kinsfolk who were in total control in Makkah at that time, as he had no cause to fear the Messenger against the strength and might of the unbelievers had he been a hypocrite.

Moreover, if his purported hypocrisy was for a worldly personal interest, one is made to ask, what worldly interest was Abu Bakr seeking to achieve with the Messenger of Allah who, at that time, was alone and on the run, being chased and might have even been killed by the same powerful Makkan unbelievers who would never believe him?.¹²⁷

126 Al-Mahmudi, 'Nahj as-Sa'adah Fi Mustadrak Nahj al-Balaghah' (2/639). In the footnote, they mentioned that surely that had happened in the days of Mu'awiyah, describing him with very bad qualities. (Translator).

127 The logically accepted assumption is for a hypocrite to follow the most powerful even if, in his inner self, he follows the weak and shares his

belief. But for him to follow a lonely, weak and helpless man and expose himself to the danger of being killed, while his mind is actually with the most powerful, is something logically inconsistent. That is why it is difficult for a sensible person even among the common and lay non-Muslims to accept the *Shi'ites'* view about the companions of the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ). How could a man be so gullible as not to perceive that the people around him are his enemies and do not share with him any of the opinions he professes, despite the fact that he lived with them for as long a time enough for the most imbecile fool to depict, from the actions and statements of his partner and companion, whether he is on good terms with him or not? What more if that man is a messenger sent by Allah to deliver His final message to mankind? The companions of the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) lived with him a sincere life, the best any human being can claim to have lived with his most beloved persons. They believed in him at a time his closest kin rejected him. They accepted his call when he was being threatened with death at the hands of the strongest powers that were in the Quraish tribe. They used to depart unobserved out of their families' sight to have contact with him, and hear from the words that came out of his mouth. They used to gather around him and secretly perform their prayers at a time each of them was afraid of his own father, his own brother, and in fact all his other relatives to know that he identified himself with the call of Muhammad (ﷺ). They suffered together with him the incessant atrocities of the unbelievers. When the situation got worst and unbearable they were forced to migrate to an alien country, some went to Abyssinia, leaving behind them their wives, their beloved sons and daughters and their wealth. When the Messenger was commanded to leave for Madina, they did not hesitate to leave their dear relatives for the noble Prophet (ﷺ). He himself moved with no one but Abu Bakr, his closest associate. They were followed by the unbelievers who were so eager to bring the life of the Prophet to an end in order to terminate, once and for all, the message he carried. He and Abu Bakr spent three consecutive days in a cave, afraid of being seen by the unbelievers, and Abu Bakr was so upset, not for his own life, but for the life of the Prophet (ﷺ), and afraid of the message being interrupted or being brought to an end. When they reached their new destination those companions, joined by their new hosts gave the Messenger of Allah all they had to protect and help him deliver the message with which Allah sent him. They fought their own kin. Some even killed their own fathers, until the message stood strongly on its feet. They loved the messenger so much that they used to lick and swallow his sputum. They used to seek Allah's blessing by making any physical contact with his body. Each of them was eager to keep and own whatever fell into

92 In many places in the Qur'an, Allah praises the companions of the Messenger (ﷺ). He says,

"But My mercy encompasses all things. So I will decree it [especially] for those who fear Me and give zakah and those who believe in Our verses. Those who follow the Messenger, the unlettered prophet, whom they find written [i.e., mentioned] in what they have of the Torah and the Gospel, who enjoins upon them what is right and forbids them what is wrong and makes lawful for them the good things and prohibits for them the evil and relieves them of their burden and the shackles

his hands of the Messengers' belongings he disposed of. One of them relates of his experience with the Messenger, and that he was the last thing he loved before he embraced Islam, but after becoming a Muslim, he was very shy of the Messenger that he could not look directly at his face, out of strong love and fear of going against any of his commands. Allah gave the companions another lesson by taking away the life of the Messenger to make them know that the most important responsibility they had to bear was to spread that pure message they were taught by the Messenger, that is the worship of the only deity that deserves worship, taking examples from the precious life and practice of the Messenger. They fully understood this lesson, as such they continued spreading the message to all nations through all the means with which they were endowed until Islam found its way into all neighbouring nations and tribes. The Messenger left this world believing that he had really delivered the message and that those first and most close associates who were privileged to have received the message from him had really and sincerely accepted and understood it. As such he was very much pleased with them. It is therefore totally untenable to believe that, despite the length of time he lived with them, he could not know that they were hypocrites – as the *Shi'ites* believe – and that all they were after was worldly gains, or that they have become apostates and out of the fold of Islam for nothing but the false claim that they disregarded a false command believed to have been given by the Prophet in respect of 'Ali's caliphate after him, even though no one could – to this date – establish sound evidence from the Qur'an or the plain statement of the Prophet to that effect. This is, surely, something that can hardly find its way into the mind of a sensible person with a sound faculty of reasoning. (Translator).

which were upon them. So they who have believed in him, honoured him, supported him and followed the light which was sent down with him – it is those who will be successful."} (Surah Al-A'raf: 156-157).

And Allah says,

{Those [believers] who responded to Allah and the Messenger after injury had struck them. For those who did good among them and feared Allah is a great reward. Those to whom people [i.e. hypocrites] said, "Indeed, the people have gathered against you, so fear them." But it [merely] increased them in faith, and they said, "Sufficient for us is Allah, and [He is] the best Disposer of affairs."} (Surah Al 'Imran : 172-173).

In another verse He says,

{"It is He who supported you with His help and with the believers. And brought together their hearts. If you had spent all that is in the earth, you could not have brought their hearts together, but Allah brought them together. Indeed, He is Exalted in Might and Wise."} (Surah Al-Anfal: 62-63).

He further says:

{"O Prophet, sufficient for you is Allah and whoever follows you of the believers."} (Surah Al-Anfal: 64).

He says:

{"You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong and believe in Allah."} (Surah Al 'Imran: 110).

A host of other verses in praise of the companions are present in the Qur'an.

The *Shi'ites* believe that the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) were true believers during the life of the Prophet, and they only became apostates after that.

Oh, how wonderful! How could they agree on the false claim that all the companions became apostate after him? And for what reason?

How could they have helped the prophet in times of hardships and difficulties, sacrificing their souls as ransom for him, but then become apostates immediately after his death, and without any specific reason?

The only reason the *Shi'ites* could mention is that they became apostates because they agreed to pledge their allegiance to Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه).

But the issue is, why would the companions of the Messenger of Allah agree on giving their pledge to Abu Bakr? What threat were they afraid of from Abu Bakr? Had Abu Bakr that kind of power and authority on them such that he could coerce them into accepting him as a caliph? By the way, Abu Bakr was from the clan of Banu Taim among the Quraishi tribe, who were the smallest clan in terms of population. The most populated and influential clans among the Quraish were Banu Hashim, Banu 'Abd ad-Dar and Banu Makhzum.

So if Abu Bakr was not strong enough to force the companions to give him their pledge, then why would all of them sacrifice their *jihad*, their faith, their help for the

Prophet and the religion, their virtue of early acceptance of Islam, and sacrifice their world and hereafter for the sake of someone not from their strongest and most influential clans, that is Abu Bakr (ﷺ)?

93 If the companions became apostates after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ), as the *Shi'ites* believe, why then did they fight the apostates – the followers of the most notorious pseudo-prophets: Musailamah, Tulaihah ibn Khuwailid, al-Aswad al-'Ansi and Sijah, and others, and above that forced them to return to the fold of Islam? Why did they not help these renegade parties or at least leave them alone, if they were themselves apostates?

94 Allah's natural and legal rule on earth is that the immediate companions of all Prophets are the best among the followers of their religion. That is why if the adherents of any religion are asked: who are the best among the followers of your religion, they would say: the companions of the Messengers.

If the followers of the Torah are asked: who are the best among the followers of your religion? They would say: the companions of Moses (ﷺ), and if the followers of the Gospel would be asked the same question, they would surely say: the companions of Jesus (ﷺ). The same is true of the followers of all the Prophets, and that is because, the companions of any prophet are closer and more deeply associated with the revelation sent down with that prophet, and their knowledge and acquaintance with prophecy and prophets are stronger and more reliable.

So, why should the case be different with our Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ), whom Allah has chosen to bear the

everlasting and all-encompassing message, and who came with the complete and tolerant law? Why should the case be different with this last Prophet for the advent of whom Allah had prepared messengers and prophets before him, and the one who had been mentioned in all divinely revealed books? How could his most immediate and close companions reject him – as the *Shi'ites* believe -, while they were the ones who actually believed in him, helped, honoured and supported him?

What meaning have you – *Shi'ites* – left for the message of Muhammad (ﷺ), and what significance have you attached to this divine law, having believed that the most close associates of Muhammad (ﷺ) had deserted him and became apostates? Going by your line of thinking, if his most close associates were apostates, then those that came after them among those pious and great warriors who left their families and homes in order to help and support the Messenger (ﷺ), and fought their own fathers and brethren, and after his death conquered many countries and brought them under Islam through their sound knowledge and by the strong words of the Qur'an and the power of their swords - are more deserving to become unbelievers, apostates and great losers.

95 We do find that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) did not practice *taqiyyah* in the most difficult of situations he found himself in, while the *Shi'ites* – as discussed earlier - claim that this *taqiyyah* is nine-tenth of the whole religion, and that their assumed imams did practice it in almost all situations. Why don't they follow the steps of their grandfather?

96 We also find that 'Ali did not consider his opponents unbelievers, not even the *Kharijites* who fought and harmed him, and declared him an unbeliever. What is wrong with the *Shi'ites* that they fail to imitate him in that, even though they heedlessly and boldly declare the companions of Muhammad (ﷺ), nay his wives, the mothers of the faithful, to be infidels?

97 The *Shi'ites* do not regard the *ijma'* (consensus of the 'ulama) as a binding and reliable source of law in itself, rather it is only accepted if it includes the opinion of the '*ma'sum*' (the infallible Imam).¹²⁸ This is sheer nonsense, because if that is the case, the consensus would be of no value at all and there is no need for it anymore.

98 The *Shi'ites* consider the *Zaidis* infidels even though the *Zaidis* are loyal to the cause of the *Ahl al-Bait*, which indicates that the *Shi'ites'* main concern is not the love of *Ahl al-Bait* as they claim, but rather their unabated and incessant hatred of the companions of Muhammad (ﷺ) and the pious predecessors of this Ummah.¹²⁹

99 Despite their rejection of the *ijma'* under the pretext that it lacks the opinion of the infallible, we do find the *Shi'ites* accepting the opinion of a single woman called Hakimah on the existence of their so-called awaited Mahdi, regardless of the fact that no one had reliable information about her or the truth of her testimony.

128 See: Ibn al-Mutahhar al-Hilli, 'Tahzib al-Wusul' (p.70), and Husain Ma'tuq al-Marji'iyah ad-Diniyyah' (p.16).

129 For further information on this, see: 'Abdullah As-Salafi's treatise 'Takfir as-Shi'ah Li 'Umum al-Muslimin'. The author has mentioned a number of unequivocal statements of the *Shi'ites* in which they explicitly declare that whoever is not a *Shi'ite*, is an unbeliever and infidel, the *Zaidis* inclusive..

100 The *Shi'ites* believe that 'Ali (عليه السلام) was the most eligible for the caliphate based on the hadith in which the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said to him: "You are to me like Aaron was to Moses".¹³⁰ But we find that Aaron did not succeed Moses (in leading the children of Israel).¹³¹ He was rather succeeded by Joshua (Yusha' ibn Nun).

101 The *Shi'ites* encourage their followers to indulge in grave offenses and mortal sins based on the false premise that: "Loving 'Ali is a good act with which no sin will cause you any harm". This is totally rejected by the Qur'an in which Allah clearly warns people against any sin under any premise, and explicitly declares that,

"It [i.e. Paradise] is not [obtained] by your wishful thinking nor by that of the People of the Scripture. Whoever does a wrong will be recompensed for it, and he will not find besides Allah a protector or a helper." (Surah An-Nisa': 123).

102 One of the ironically strange tenets of *Shi'ism* is the issue of al-Bada'¹³² which the *Shi'ites* ascribe to Allah, The Most Exalted, while at the same time they believe that their Imams have full knowledge of the Unseen (*Ghaib*). Are the imams, then, greater than Allah?

130 Reported by Bukhari and Muslim.

131 Nay, Aaron even died before Moses (عليه السلام), (Translator).

132 The word Al-Bada' literally means to become clear, and the *Shi'ites* mean by the terminology that a new knowledge or information appears to Allah after being ignorant of it, or that Allah changes His mind on something He decreed because of a new knowledge that appears to Him. (Translator).

103 History has confirmed that the *Shi'ites* have always been on the side of the enemies of Islam – the Jews and the Christians and the polytheists, as witnessed on a number of occasions, the most notable of which includes the fall of Baghdad at the hands of the Mongols, the fall of Quds at the hands of the Christians etc. Would a true and sincere Muslim commit such an act, going against the clear verses of the Qur'an that prohibits conniving with the Jews and Christians and taking them as helpers to achieve an end? Did 'Ali or any of his children and grandchildren fall into this error?

104 We do find that many *Shi'ites* speak ill of al-Hasan the son of 'Ali (عليه السلام) and strongly blame him and his progeny regardless of his being one of their Imams and one of the *Ahl al-Bait*.¹³³

105 Whoever studies the tenets of the Shi'i faith carefully finds serious differences and deep conflicts that ensue between the various denominations of the madhhab, to the extent that some even consider their opponents unbelievers, despite the closeness in terms of time between them. One clear example is that their scholar Ahmad al-Ahsa'i formed a sect known afterwards as 'ash-Shaikhhiyyah'. His disciple Kazim ar-Rushti came later on and formed the 'al-Kashfiyyah' sect. Then came the disciple of ar-Rushti, Muhammad Karim Khan and instituted another sect called 'al-Karimkhaniyyah', and a female disciple of his by name 'Qurrat al-'Ain' formed a sect called: 'al-Qartiyyah'. On the other hand, Mirza 'Ali ash-Shirazi formed the

133 See: 'A'yān ash-Shi'ah' (1/26), and 'Kitāb Salīm ibn Qais' (p.288).

'al-Bayaniyyah' sect, while Mirza Husain 'Ali formed the 'Baha'iyyah' sect.

Notice how all these denominations stemmed out within the same era and within a very close space of time. Allah, the Most Exalted, warns:

{ "And do not follow [other] ways, for you will be separated from His way." } (Surah Al-An'am: 153).

106 When the revolting rebels besieged 'Uthman ibn 'Affan in his house, 'Ali (ﷺ) did a lot to protect him and he drove some of them away, and sent his two sons al-Hasan and al-Husain, and his nephew 'Abdullah ibn Ja'far to the house.¹³⁴ Only that 'Uthman had decisively made up his mind that no one's blood would be spilled in his name, as such he commanded that everybody should stay at home and leave their arms. This surely refutes the assumed enmity the *Shi'ites* claim to have been between the two.

107 Both Sunni and *Shi'ite* sources confirm the fact that 'Umar (ﷺ) used to seek the opinion of 'Ali on many occasions and on various issues.¹³⁵ So had he been an oppressor and wrong doer – as believed by the *Shi'ites* - he wouldn't have sought the truth, because an oppressive tyrant never seeks the truth.

134 Reported by Bukhari and Muslim.

135 Reported by Bukhari and Muslim.

108 It has been unanimously confirmed in history that Salman al-Farisi had once been the governor of al-Mad'in in the days of 'Umar (ؓ)¹³⁶, and 'Ammar ibn Yasir was once the governor of al-Kufa.¹³⁷ These two companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) were believed by the *Shi'ites* to be among the closest associates and helpers of 'Ali (ؓ). The question here is, had these two pious companions believed 'Umar to be an apostate, an oppressor and one who usurped the caliphate from 'Ali, they wouldn't have accepted to serve under him. How could they support an oppressor and apostate, while Allah, The Most Exalted, says:

{ "And do not incline toward those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the Fire." } (Surah Hud: 113).

109 The *Shi'ites* believe that their imams are infallible, and that their assumed Mahdi exists and that some of their *mullahs* – believed to be about thirty - have some sort of contact with him to this day. If that is the case, how could they explain the enormous amount of conflicts and differences that ensue between their various sects, so much so that you hardly find the like of it in any sect other than *Shi'ism*? Nay, one finds that almost each and every Shi'i *mujtahid* and *marji'* has his own *madhhab* in some sort of way. Despite their claim that the existence of an Imam – meaning the Mahdi - with whom Allah's proof will be established on people is an indispensable necessity, and despite their belief in his physical existence and that they contact and communicate with him from

136 Reported by Bukhari and Muslim.

137 Ibid: (1/422).

time to time, the *Shi'ites* differ between themselves more than any other sect in the world.¹³⁸

But in spite of all this, they ascribe to their scholar, al-Majlisi, that he has mentioned a *hadith* saying that the hidden imam is invisible and whoever claims to have seen him is a liar. So how could some *mullahs* claim to have the privilege of seeing and having contact with him many times?

110 The *Shi'ites* say that it is unlawful for the ummah to live for the shortest span of time without an upright imam that stands in Allah's cause and establishes His proof on the people. On the other side they attach so much significance to the doctrine of *taqiyyah* that they consider it to be nine-tenth of the entire religion, and that it is lawful for the Imam to practice *taqiyyah* in all situations. Nay, some of them even say it is commendable and a great virtue in his respect, because an Imam is considered the most pious of all people. So, if the Imam would practice *taqiyyah* how can Allah's proof be established through him, for it will be difficult to ascertain whether his statement at any given time is true or false on the pretext of *taqiyyah*.

111 The *Shi'ites* believe that the knowledge of the twelve imams is a fundamental condition of faith. This raises a serious question, that is, what about someone who died before the number of the imams reached twelve? Nay, what should be the answer had the dead person been an imam himself?

138 Expectedly, the so called Mahdi should have helped them out of those conflicting opinions, and should have made them follow one non-contradicting ruling on all issues.(Translator).

Moreover, some of the *Shi'ite* imams were not aware of who would be the imam after them. How, then, could the *Shi'ites* regard the knowledge of the imams to be a condition of faith?

112 The author of the book '*Nahj al-Balaghah*' reports that when the news reached 'Ali (عليه السلام) that the Ansar claimed that they were the right legatees to the caliphate after the death of the Messenger (ﷺ), he said to some people: "Why didn't you point out to them the fact that the Messenger (ﷺ) has commanded – with regard to the Ansar – that we should be good to the good amongst them, and forgive the offending amongst them?" They said: 'What evidence is contained in this statement?' He said: "Had the *Imamate* been their eligible right, the Messenger would not have given the directive that we should mean well to them".¹³⁹

By the same token one can say to the *Shi'ites* that the Messenger (ﷺ) has given the directive that we should mean well for the *Ahl al-Bait* and treat them with all goodness, in his statement: "I remind you to fear Allah with regards to my household". So, had the *imamate* been their sole right and is never given to anyone else apart from the members of the *Ahl al-Bait*, the Messenger (ﷺ) would not have given the directive in that pattern.

113 If someone tells you about a believing, pious and God-fearing leader that led a group of people mixed in their ideological inclinations, some were Muslims while some were sheer hypocrites, and by Allah's grace, he was able to make out the hypocrites by the words of their mouth.

139 Nahj Al-Balaghah (p.97).

But regardless of all this the man chose to distance himself from the pious ones, and chose among the hypocrites his closest associates and gave them the most senior positions in his court, and made them lead the rest of the people in his own presence. Nay he contracted marital relations with those hypocrites by marrying their daughters and giving his own daughters to some of them in marriage, and lastly he died at the time he was at peace and very well pleased with them.

What kind of man will you regard him?

This is the *Shi'ites'* view about our noble Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ).

114

The *Shi'ite* scholar al-Hurr al-'Amili reports from Abu Ja'far that, in his explanation of the meaning of the verse,

{"And hold not to marriage bonds with disbelieving women."} (Surah Al-Mumtahinah: 10),

he said: "Whoever is married to a disbelieving woman, meaning a woman belonging to a religion other than Islam, while he himself is a Muslim, let him call her to Islam. If she accepts, then she will continue to be his wife, otherwise she will be considered free from his bond, for Allah has prohibited the believing men from holding to marriage bonds with disbelieving women".¹⁴⁰

Going by this, one must accept that, had 'A'isha (رضي الله عنها) been a disbelieving woman as the *Shi'ites* allege, it must have been

140 Al-Hurr al-'Amili 'Wasa'il ash-Shi'ah' (20/542).

obligatory upon the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) to divorce her as is clear from the Qur'an, unless, of course, if the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) was not aware of her hypocrisy, apostasy and disbelief, while the *Shi'ites* are well aware of that.

115 One of the *Shi'ite* sects by name '*al-Khattabiyyah*' is of the view that the Imam after Ja'far as-Sadiq should have been his son Isma'il, but the *Shi'ite* scholars (meaning the twelvers) refuted that by arguing that Isma'il died before Abu 'Abdullah (Ja'far as-Sadiq), and that a dead man can never be the successor of a living one...".¹⁴¹

Here we say to the twelver *Shi'ites*, you people argue in favour of 'Ali's *imamate* with the *hadith* in which the Prophet (ﷺ) is reported to have said to 'Ali, "You are to me like Aaron was to Moses", and it is known that Aaron died before Moses (عليه السلام), and you have agreed to the fact that 'A dead man can not be the successor of a living man'.

116 To argue in favour of the assumed *imamate* of the so-called twelve imams, the *Shi'ites* use the *hadith*, "This issue (meaning the deen of Islam) will ever remain powerful up to the passing of twelve caliphs all of whom are from the Quraishi tribe". In another version, "Twelve leaders would come to pass", while in yet another report, it reads: "People's affairs will be in order as long as they are under the leadership of twelve men".

It is said here to the *Shi'ites*, this *hadith*, going by all its different versions is clear on the fact that those twelve men

141 Kamal ad-Din Wa Tamam an-Ni'mah' (p.105).

would be caliphs and leaders on people in the political sense. But it is known by all that none of the so-called *Shi'ite* imams was a political caliph except 'Ali and his son al-Hasan (ﷺ). The *hadith* has nothing to do with the *Shi'ites* and their assumed imams, and it did not mention the names of those caliphs or the name of any of them.¹⁴²

117 The *Shi'ites* – as has been mentioned here a number of times – claim that all but a very few of the companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) became apostates after his death.

We say to them, a person only becomes apostate for one of two reasons: either for a *shubhah* (vague and doubtful matters and sophistic arguments) or for a *shahwah* (a personal interest based on one's whims and impulse). And it is known that ambiguities about religion were

142 Ridiculously, rather, the *Shi'ites* only cling to this particular hadith for nothing but the mere mention of the number 'twelve', unintelligently ignoring the qualities with which the caliphs and the conditions are described. One important quality prophesied in the hadith is that Islam will continue to be strong and might in the days of the mentioned caliphs. It suffices one to explore through Islamic history, more especially the days of the rightly-guided caliphs, Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman and 'Ali to conclude that Islam was never stronger than it was in the reigns of these pious servants of Allah. On the other hand those believed by the *Shi'ites* to be Imams – apart from the two mentioned – were never political leaders, much less contributing to making Islam strong. They were pious individuals of the Muslim community in their days and lived a simple and humble life. On the contrary, Islam has never been weaker than it was at the time when some people emerged claiming to be following those so-called Imams and invented a new religion (Shi'ism) which they claim to be the religion of those Imams who in the actual sense, had nothing to do with these invented tenets based on which the Ummah of Muhammad (ﷺ) was divided and its pious predecessors being vilified and considered unbelievers. (Translator).

stronger in the early days of the religion when it was new to all people. So whoever was blessed with a strong and unshakeable faith in those days when the religion was weaker, would have stronger faith when the religion gained ground and became stronger and spread all over the globe.

As regards following personal interests, it should be noted that those pious people left their houses and wealth, and left behind them their might and honour for the sake of their love for Allah and His Messenger, under no duress at all from the Messenger. How then could people with this kind of powerful faith leave the religion for some worldly gains the like of which they left behind them at Makkah?

118 The *Shi'ites* believe that the *Sahabah* were not reputable and just. But we find in reliable Shi'i sources evidences that confirm their being reputable and just. They report that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) has said in his farewell pilgrimage speech: "May Allah bless the servant who heard my statement and fully understood it, then conveyed it to him who did not hear..."¹⁴³. How could the Messenger (ﷺ) trust the *Sahabah* in conveying his message were they not reputable, just and reliable?

119 A *Shi'ite* was once asked: Didn't the Messenger of Allah command us to choose pious and decent wives, and good and reputable in-laws?

He said: Of course, yes.

143 Al-Khisal (p.149-150, hadith No.182).

He was then asked: Will you agree to marry the daughter of a person born from adultery?

He said: Allah forbid.

He was asked: But you *Shi'ites* falsely claim that 'Umar ibn al-Khattab was the son of an adulteress called (*Sihak*)¹⁴⁴, and your mullah Ni'mat Allah al-Jaza'iri shamelessly claim that 'Umar (ﷺ) was suffering from an illness the relief for which only comes from the semen of a male person. Furthermore, you people claim that his daughter Hafsa was a wicked hypocrite like her father, and a disbeliever!

Do you think that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) would take for an in-law someone who was born as a result of an adulterous affair?

Would he ever choose to marry a bad woman and a hypocrite?

By Allah, you have surely slandered the Messenger of Allah and his companions, and preferred for them what you will not choose for yourselves.

120 If the number of hypocrites and apostates among the companions is as great as the *Shi'ites* claim, how could Islam have been spread the way it was? And how could the Persian and Roman empires have been conquered, nay how could Bait al-Maqdis (Jerusalem) have been brought under Islam?

144 Al-Bahrani 'al-Kashkul' (3/212), and the book titled: 'Laqad Shayya'ani al-Husain' (p.177).

121 In his effort to give an excuse for 'Ali's acceptance of Abu Bakr and 'Umar as caliphs, the *Shi'ite* scholar Muhammad Al Kashif al-Ghita asserts: "But when he ('Ali) saw that the two caliphs before him – meaning Abu Bakr and 'Umar – had exerted so much effort in spreading the word of Tauhid, and in preparing and equipping the Muslim army for *jihad*, and in expanding the Islamic borders by conquering nations, and their being free from favouritism and despotism, he gave his pledge of allegiance and sought peace".¹⁴⁵

So, this *Shi'ite mullah* confesses that Abu Bakr and 'Umar had surely spread the word of Islam, prepared armies for *jihad*, and conquered many countries!! Why then, do the *Shi'ites* accuse them of being major stakeholders in disbelief, hypocrisy and apostasy? What kind of contradiction is this?¹⁴⁶

145 Asl ash-Shi'ah Wa Usuluha (p.49).

146 One thing plainly clear is that these two pious and great caliphs of Islam could not be leaders in the spread of Islam and fighting for its cause, and at the same time be leaders in disbelief and hypocrisy. I do have the feeling that Al Kashif al-Ghita found himself in a difficult and helpless situation. This is because, on the one side, his fundamental sources claimed to be reported from their assumed Imams do declare these two caliphs as infidels, and on the other, it has been authentically confirmed that 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام) did actually accept them as caliphs. To avoid being charged of going against what 'Ali himself did in his lifetime, Al Kashif al-Ghita sought to present this 'excuse', not knowing that this idea will bring him in total collusion with what is reported from his predecessors that Abu Bakr and 'Umar were actually disbelievers. Moreover, 'Ali did not accept Abu Bakr and 'Umar at the same time, rather he accepted Abu Bakr during his time, and made it public in the masjid, and after the death of Abu Bakr he accepted 'Umar immediately without any delay. But Al-Kashif al-Ghita's assumption here is that he only accepted them and pledged his allegiance to them after witnessing what they did in favour of Islam, that is at the end of

122 The *Shi'ites* present as proof - to their false claim that the *sahabah* became apostates after the death of the Prophet - the *hadith*: "Some men among whom I know and who know me would come to me (on the day of judgement, in order to drink from my pond) but they would be driven away from it. And I would say: O, my companions, my companions! But it would be said to me: 'You know not what they innovated after you'.¹⁴⁷

We reply them by saying, this *hadith* speaks in a general way without mentioning anybody by name. It exempts neither 'Ammar ibn Yasir, nor al-Miqdad ibn al-Aswad, nor Abu Dharr, nor Salman al-Farisi, nor any other person among whom the *Shi'ites* believe were not apostates. Nay, it does not even exempt 'Ali (ﷺ) himself. So, why would you specify some and leave out others. This kind of selective discrimination can be done by anyone, because anybody that has ill feelings against any of the companions can claim that the *hadith* speaks about him.¹⁴⁸

'Umar's reign, which is incorrect in totalilty. Rather 'Ali was among the great warriors who fought under Abu Bakr and 'Umar.(Translator).

147 Reported by al-Bukhari.

148 The *hadith* rather speaks about those Arab villagers (al-A'raab) who left the religion of Islam after the death of the Prophet, and whom Abu Bakr and the rest of the companions fought to make them return to Islam. As for the Prophet's word "My companions", it still refers to those Arab villagers because they were following the religion during his life and that is what he means by the word *sahabi* here. But if the *Shi'ites* will claim that rather the closest companions are hereby referred to, they have no reason whatsoever to exclude 'Ali, 'Ammar, al-Miqdad, Salman al-Farisi and those among the companions whom they consider the only Muslims after the death of the Prophet, because the word *sahabi* is applicable to all of them. But we do not subscribe to this false assumption, for all of the aforementioned together with all other companions – above all Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman and 'Ali - were the best of this Ummah, and were the leaders of the faithful.

123 In one of his famous speeches, Malik ibn al-Ashtar, one of the closest associates of 'Ali (ﷺ), and one of the most respected personalities in the sight of the *Shi'ites*, says: "O people, Allah, the Most Exalted, has sent His Messenger Muhammad (ﷺ) to you as a giver of glad tidings and a warner, and sent down to him His Book in which is made clear the lawful and the unlawful, and the obligatory and commendable religious duties. He then took him away after perfectly accomplishing his divine duty. Then, Abu Bakr succeeded him in leading the faithful, and followed his steps and imitated his practical examples. Abu Bakr assigned 'Umar who also followed the same steps".¹⁴⁹

So, Malik ibn al-Ashtar here praises Abu Bakr and 'Umar with words they really deserve, but in spite of all that, the *Shi'ites* knowingly ignore these words of praise and do not mention them in their congregations and al-Husainiyyahs that are never free of vilifying and abusing Abu Bakr and 'Umar. Why so?

124 To prove the *Shi'ites'* inconsistent and illogical line of thinking, Ibn Hazm ('Ali ibn Sa'id d. 456 A.H.), comments on 'Ali (ﷺ) saying: "He (Ali) was late in giving his pledge to Abu Bakr for six months."¹⁵⁰ The negative effect of this

The Prophet never refers to them in the *hadith*. But if they say that the companions were apostates for accepting Abu Bakr as caliph after the death of the Prophet instead of 'Ali, then we remind them that 'Ali himself and 'Ammar, al-Miqdad, Abu Dharr and Salman al-Farisi all accepted Abu Bakr instead of 'Ali, so if the companions were infidels for this particular reason the *Shi'ites* should raise their voice loudly and declare these five as infidels as well. (Translator).

149 'Malik ibn al-Ashtar – His Speeches and Views' (p.89), and Ibn A'atham 'Al-Futuh' (1/396).

150 Scholars differ on whether 'Ali gave his *bai'ah* to Abu Bakr (*may Allah*

action is one of two things: If his refusal to accept Abu Bakr was right then his acceptance (at the time he did) must be wrong. If, on the other hand, giving his pledge to Abu Bakr was the right thing to do, then he must be wrong to defer it up to six months".¹⁵¹

125 Why do the *Shi'ites* 'offer' the quality of infallibility to Fatima (ﷺ) and deny the same to her two full sisters Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthum both of whom were also part of the Messenger's flesh like Fatima?

126 If it is said to the *Shi'ites*, why did 'Ali (ﷺ) choose to refrain from fighting for the caliphate after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ) despite their claim that he was explicitly mentioned by the Prophet as the rightful heir to the throne, they usually say, that is because the Prophet (ﷺ) had commanded him not to cause any civil strife or unsheathe a sword. It is said to them, why, then, did he unsheathe the sword on his opponents during the two conflicts of al-Jamal and Siffin, in which thousands of Muslims were killed? Who was the most deserving person to be fought with the sword? Was it the first oppressor, or the fourth, or the tenth...?!

127 The *Shi'ites* do not make a clear-cut distinction between the Prophets and the imams. Their scholar al-Majlisi, commenting on the imams, even said: "We are unaware of a single reason that prevents them from being described as

be pleased with both) immediately after the death of the Prophet and after the deliberations of *Saqifah* when all people publicly gave their allegiance to Abu Bakr, as some narratives indicate, or that he deferred it until after 6 months, as per other narratives. Ibn Hazm is of the second opinion.

151 'Al-Fisal Fi l-Milal Wa l-Ahwa' Wa n-Nihal' (4/235).

prophets if not for the purpose of maintaining the validity of the title "*Khatam al-Anbiya*" (i.e Seal of the Prophets, as mentioned in the Qur'an in respect of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ). And our minds cannot conceive any difference between prophecy and imamate".¹⁵²

What then is the significance of the belief in the fact that Muhammad was the seal of the Prophets, if the duties and characteristics peculiar to the prophets, like infallibility, conveying messages from Allah, miracles and other such things do not cease with the death of the seal of the prophets Muhammad (ﷺ), but are rather believed by the *Shi'ites* to extend after him to cover up to twelve persons?

128 The *Shi'ites* assume that one of the evidences in favour of 'Ali's imamate immediately after the Prophet (ﷺ) is that the Prophet himself left 'Ali behind to take charge of Madina and those who remain in it when he and the rest of the companions left for the Battle of Tabuk, and he said to him: "You are to me like Aaron was to Moses".¹⁵³

Had this been correct, the Prophet (ﷺ) would have commanded 'Ali to be in charge of Madina in all the battles he was left behind, instead of charging other companions with the same responsibility. It has been historically confirmed that the Prophet (ﷺ) had assigned 'Uthman ibn 'Affan and 'Abdullah ibn Umm Maktum (رضي الله عنه) to take charge of Madina on some other occasions. Why then should 'Ali's experience of this prophetic duty be used as an argument in favour of his being entitled exclusively to

152 Bihar al-Anwar (26/28).

153 Reported by Bukhari and Muslim.

the caliphate after the Prophet (ﷺ) and not used in favour of others who shared the same experience?

129 The *Shi'ites* assume that the obligation of appointing the imams is based on the logical rule that is called the rule of *lutf* (Allah's grace and benevolence). Ironically, we find that their assumed twelfth imam was claimed to be invisible since his childhood and has still not revealed himself up to this day. What benevolence do the Muslims gain from his being 'imam'?

130 They also believe that sending Messengers and assigning Imams are two obligatory duties on Allah – Exalted be He – based on the rule of *lutf*. But we find that Allah has sent His Messengers and supported them with miracles and destroyed those who rejected them. We ask the *Shi'ites*: what evidence is there to show that Allah has backed and supported your so-called imams and is angry towards those who rejected and fought them?

131 The *Shi'ites* claim that their imams were infallible, but strong evidences against this claim have been unanimously reported, some of which are as follows:

- ❑ Al-Hasan, the son of 'Ali ibn Abi Talib used to disagree with his father on the issue of his battles and conflicts with those seeking reprisal on the killers of 'Uthman (رضي الله عنه). One of the two Imams must surely be right while the other must be wrong despite the claim that each of them was according to the *Shi'ites* an infallible Imam.¹⁵⁴

154 Infallibility according to the *Shi'ites* does not mean merely being free from any sin, either major or minor, but rather includes, in addition to that, being free from any mistake or forgetfulness. (Translator).

- ❑ Al-Husain the son of 'Ali ibn Abi Talib (عليه السلام) also disagreed with his brother al-Hasan on the issue of the truce that took place between him and Mu'awiyah which led to al-Hasan's cession of the caliphate. No doubt that one of the two was right and the other was wrong, and both were believed by the *Shi'ites* to be infallible imams;
- ❑ Nay, some *Shi'ite* sources even report from 'Ali (عليه السلام) that he said: "Do not refrain from telling the truth, or being just in offering advice, for I am not sure of being free from mistakes".¹⁵⁵

132 The *Shi'ites* strongly condemn the scholars of *Ahlus Sunnah* in Saudi Arabia for the fatwah they issued to the effect that it is lawful to seek the help of the disbelievers in times of necessity, i.e. against the *Ba'th* party (Iraq). But then we find Ibn al-Mutahhar al-Hilli, one of their celebrated scholars, reporting in his book titled '*Muntaha at-Talab Fi Tahqeeq al-Madhhab*'¹⁵⁶ the consensus of the *Shi'ites* – excluding at-Tusi – on the permissibility of seeking the assistance of *Ahl Adh-Dhimma* in the war against oppressors'.

What a contradiction!

133 One of the fundamental rules of the Shi'i religion is that *imamah* is valid for anyone among the *Ahl al-Bait* who happens to claim it and is able to display some miracles to prove his claim, but that notwithstanding, they do

155 *Al-Kafi* (8/256), and *Bihar al-Anwar* (27/253).

156 (2/985). Another example in our contemporary world is the *Shi'ite mullahs* call on the infidel invaders to oust the regime in Iraq in order to have an exclusive *Shi'ite* government.

not accept the imamah of Zaid ibn 'Ali even though he claimed it. They rather contrarily, believe in the imamah of their assumed invisible Mahdi, who never claimed it nor did he ever display any miracle, because, as they claim, he was an infant.

134

When Allah, the Most Exalted, sent down the verse,

"Indeed, Allah commands you to render trusts to whom they are due."} (Surah an-Nisa': 58),

the Prophet (ﷺ) called members of the Bani Shaibah clan and gave them the key to the Ka'bah, and said: "Take it, O Bani Talha, and it should remain with you for ever and ever to the Day of Judgement. No one takes it from you but a tyrant".¹⁵⁷ He said that in respect of an issue that only concerns the custodians of the Ka'bah. Why didn't he say something like that on 'Ali's caliphate after him, even though it is so great an issue that it concerns every Muslim, and many vital issues of interest to the Muslims are subjected to it?

135

The *Shi'ites* concocted a '*hadith*' and ascribed it to the Prophet (ﷺ), that he said: "May Allah curse whoever stays behind and absents himself from the army of Usamah"¹⁵⁸, they mean by this, to curse 'Umar ibn al-Khattab (رضي الله عنه), but it escapes their minds that two inevitable options will face them particularly with regards to 'Ali (عليه السلام):

157 Reported by at-Tabarani in his 'al-Mu'jam al-Kabir' and 'al-Mu'jam al-Awsat' (see: Majma' az-Zawa'id 3/285).

158 See: Ibn al-Barraj, 'al-Muhadhdhab' (1/13), Ibn Shadhan 'al-Idaah' (p.454), and al-'Amili 'Wusul al-Akhyar' (p.68).

- ❑ Either that 'Ali (عليه السلام) did not stay behind, and that he was among the vast number of companions that went under the leadership of Usamah (عليه السلام), and if this is the case, we must accept the fact that he had accepted and submitted to the caliphate of Abu Bakr (عليه السلام) under whose order Usamah set off for the battle.¹⁵⁹
- ❑ Or that 'Ali (عليه السلام) was among those who stayed behind, in which case he would come directly under the malicious curse of the *Shi'ites*.¹⁶⁰

159 Usamah's expedition was first ordered by the Prophet (ﷺ) immediately before his death, and Usamah had reached Jurf in the outskirts of Madina when the news came to him that the Prophet's illness was intense, and he came back to seek the Prophet's permission to stay until the situation was more assuring. So he went back to Jurf waiting for what may transpire. And at last news came to him that the Prophet (ﷺ) was fully awake after being unconscious for some time, and he ordered him to return and set off once again for the expedition. He went back to Jurf and ordered people to get ready, and as he was about to leave Jurf a messenger came from his mother Umm Ayman to break the bad news that the Prophet (ﷺ), was dying, and he came back together with 'Umar and Abu Ubaidah. After the death of the Prophet (ﷺ), Abu Bakr (عليه السلام) reiterated and strongly defended the order and declared that he would never disband an army ordered by the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ). As such Usamah and the companions left Jurf and were extraordinarily victorious in the battle. As regards the Shi'ites' malicious attitude of cursing their most vehement enemy ('Umar ibn Al-Khattab رضي الله عنه) and their wicked intention of always wishing to find him at fault, it can be unmistakably seen on this issue, because they were blinded by this enmity so much so that they overlooked the fact that 'Umar was among the army under the leadership of Usamah and was with him at Jurf. But when they came back and the Prophet (ﷺ) died, Abu Bakr sought the permission of Usamah to leave 'Umar in Madina because he was one of the most senior of the companions whose advice and sound reasoning Abu Bakr was in dire need of at that crucial time. (Translator).

160 Both of these options imply that 'Ali (عليه السلام) was not the imam at that material time, and he did not claim any nass in his favour from the Prophet, for had there been one, he would have made it public and the order to set

136 The *Shi'ites* believe that 'Ali (ﷺ) was in possession of a copy of the Qur'an that was purported to have been arranged according to the order in which it was revealed.

Here they fail to call to account that 'Ali (ﷺ) ascended to the caliphate after 'Uthman (ﷺ), and he did not produce and make public that assumed complete and unadulterated copy of the Qur'an. Two other difficult dilemmas face them in this regard as well:

- ❑ Either that the so-called copy of the Qur'an was not extant at all, and that the *Shi'ites* are merely lying – as they are used to – in the name of 'Ali (ﷺ).
- ❑ Or that 'Ali himself had hidden it thereby concealing the truth from the Muslim Ummah throughout his life – far be he from that.

137 The *Shi'ites* claim that they love the *Ahl al-Bait* and the progeny of the Prophet (ﷺ), but we find them contradicting this fundamental principle, because they deny some members of the household, like *Ruqayyah* and Umm Kulthum, the two daughters of the Prophet, their lineage right and blood relation to the Prophet (ﷺ). They also reject al-'Abbas, the uncle of the Messenger (ﷺ) and all his progeny, as well as az-Zubair ibn al-'Awwam, the son of Safiyyah, the aunt of the Messenger (ﷺ). They cast their enmity on many of the children of Fatimah (ﷺ), nay, they abuse and curse some of them, like Zaid ibn 'Ali (ibn al-Husain), his son Yahya, and Ibrahim and Ja'far, the sons of Musa al-Kazim, and Ja'far ibn 'Ali, the brother of

off for the mentioned battle would have come from none other than him. (Translator).

their Imam al-Hasan al-'Askari. They even believe that al-Hasan ibn al-Hasan, whose pet name was (al-Muthanna), and his son 'Abdullah (al-Mahd), and his son Muhammad (an-Nafs az-Zakiyyah) all became apostates. The same claim they made in respect of Ibrahim ibn 'Abdullah, Zakariyyah ibn Muhammad al-Baqir, Muhammad ibn 'Abdullah ibn al-Hasan ibn al-Hasan, Muhammad ibn al-Qasim ibn al-Husain and Yahya ibn 'Umar, and others amongst the *Ahl al-Bait*.

Where, then, is the love for the *Ahl al-Bait*?

One other point that buttresses this fact is the statement of one of them in which he says, "The rest of the progeny of al-Hasan ibn 'Ali fell into grievous acts that cannot be explained as having been committed out of *taqiyyah*".¹⁶¹

The boldest and most unruly attitude indicating the *Shi'ites'* clear contradiction of their so much claimed principle.

138

Their belief that all members of the *Ahl al-Bait* in the first century were unbelievers, for, they report in their reliable sources that, "All people after the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) were apostates except three (Salman al-Farisi, Abu Dharr and al-Miqdad. Some of them raise the number to seven, and none of them was among the *Ahl al-Bait*).¹⁶² Going by their explicit statement, they have declared all to be infidels – Allah forbid.¹⁶³

161 Al-Kishshi

162 Tanqih al-Maqal (3/142).

163 The word an-nas with the *alif* and *lam* in Arabic includes the whole

139 On an individual level, we find them declaring some of the *Ahl al-Bait* infidels, mentioning them by name, like al-'Abbas, the Prophet's uncle whom they claim to be referred to by the verse,

*"And whoever is blind in this [life] will be blind in the Hereafter and more astray in way." (Surah Al-Isra': 72)*¹⁶⁴.

His son, 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbas, the learned and great exegesist, was also not spared. In al-Kulaini's *al-Kafi* there are reports alluding to declaring him an infidel and that he was an ignorant fool.¹⁶⁵ And in the book *Rijal al-Kishshi* one of them is reported to have made the following supplication: 'O Allah, curse the two sons of so-and-so and blind their eyes as you have blinded their hearts'.¹⁶⁶

Their scholar Hasan al-Mustaphawi commented on this narrative saying: 'They (the two sons referred to here) are 'Abdullah ibn 'Abbas and 'Ubaidullah ibn 'Abbas'.¹⁶⁷

The malice of the *Shi'ites* also extends to the beloved daughters of the Prophet (ﷺ) – with the exception of

human race, and there is no indication whatsoever within the statement itself to make the *Ahl al-Bait* exempt from the general meaning it carries. It is very unintelligent a statement to make more especially that it concerns declaring the best of this Ummah as infidels, the *Ahl al-Bait* inclusive. (Translator).

164 See: The oldest Shi'i book on earth, 'Kitab Salim ibn Qais al-'Amiri' (p. 92), *Ar-Randa of Al-Kafi* (8/245), and al-Majlisi's 'Hayat al-Qulub' – (In Persian) – (2/640).

165 *Al-Kafi* (1/247-248).

166 *Al-Kishshi* (p.53).

167 Ibid (p.53), al-Khu'i, 'Mu'jam Rijal al-Hadith' (12/81).

Fatimah (ﷺ), nay some of them even go to the extent of denying them the fatherhood of the noble Prophet (ﷺ).¹⁶⁸

So, where is the claimed love for *Ahl al-Bait*?

140 'Ali (ﷺ) was amongst the armies that fought in the war against the renegade apostates, and he took a woman from amongst them (Bani Hanifah) for a wife who gave birth to his son (Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah). One can therefore not avoid the fact that 'Ali (ﷺ) had actually accepted the caliphate of Abu Bakr (ﷺ), otherwise he wouldn't have participated in the campaign against the apostates.¹⁶⁹

141 Reports from Ja'far as-Sadiq on a number of issues are too contradictory. You hardly find an issue of jurisprudence, for instance, on which his opinion is unequivocal, rather he has two or more conflicting opinions. For example, on the issue of the well in which an impure object falls, sometimes he says: the well is considered like the sea, as such nothing makes it impure. At another time, he says: the well must be cleaned by draining its whole water. Some other time he says: six or seven buckets of the water must be drained. When a *Shi'ite mullah* was asked about the way out in such contradicting issues, he said it is at

168 See: *Kashf al-Ghita'* by Ja'afar an-Najafi (p.5), and *The Shi'ite Encyclopaedia* by Muhsin al-Amin (1/27).

169 This is one of the most critical proofs confirming the fact that 'Ali had in fact given his pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr immediately after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ), and not after six months. Otherwise, how could he join an army under the order of a man he did not believe to be the right caliph. That is because the battle against the apostates was waged immediately after the death of the Prophet. (Translator).

the discretion of the *mujtahid* to study the contradicting opinions and weigh them, then choose the one he wishes, and regard the remaining opinions to have been made by the imam out of *taqiyyah*. But it was said to him, what if another mujtahid happens to prefer an opinion different from that preferred by the first *mujtahid*, what should he say on the rest of the conflicting opinions? He said, he should say the same thing, that is, they are said out of *taqiyyah*. He was then told, if that is the case then the *madhhab* of Ja'far as-Sadiq is lost, because any of the opinions ascribed to him can be regarded as said out of *taqiyyah*, as there is no criteria based on which the opinion expressed by the imam out of *taqiyyah* can be differentiated from the one he said in good faith.

142 The *Shi'ites'* reliable sources in the field of *hadith* are: '*al-Wasa'il*' by al-Hurr al-'Amili (d. 1104 A.H.), '*al-Bihar*' by al-Majlisi (d. 1111 A.H.) and '*Mustadrak al-Wasa'il*' by at-Tabrasi (d. 1320 A.H.), so all of them are of recent authorship. If those *hadiths* were collected through chains of narration, how can a sensible and sound person accept narratives that were not put to writing for a time as long as eleven to thirteen centuries? And if they were actually recorded in books why were the books not found until in the later centuries? Why didn't their predecessors collect those narratives? And why are these books not mentioned in their older and most reliable sources?

143 In Shi'i literature, there are a great number of narratives and *hadiths* that are in agreement with what is found in the Sunni literature both in the field of faith and denouncing heresy and other similar fields. However, the *Shi'ites* give them meanings that distance them from their face values

for no reason other than the fact that they are against the *madhhab*, and under the premise that those narratives were said by their scholars or imams out of *taqiyyah*.

144

The author of *Nahj al-Balaghah*, one of the Shi'i reliable sources, reports some narratives in which 'Ali (عليه السلام) praised Abu Bakr and 'Umar (عليه السلام), like his comment on Abu Bakr: "He (Abu Bakr) left this world physically and spiritually clean of any filth, with very few lapses. He gained the better part of this world and was saved from its evil. He was diligently obedient to Allah and was soundly mindful of His rights on him".¹⁷⁰

The *Shi'ites* find themselves in a dilemma in dealing with such words of praise that are in marked contrast with their basic tenet of speaking ill of the companions. As such they always explain them away as spoken out of *taqiyyah*, and that 'Ali (عليه السلام) only mentioned such statements in order to mend relations with and win the love of those companions who believed that the caliphates of Abu Bakr and 'Umar (عليه السلام) were rightful and appropriate. In other words, they mean that 'Ali deceived the companions. But going by this logic, it implies that 'Ali was a hypocrite and a coward who was not bold enough to state his opinion, but rather expressed the opposite of what was concealed in his bosom, and this clearly contradicts the huge quantity of narratives the *Shi'ites* report about his excessive bravery and courage in speaking the truth.

170 Nahj al-Balaghah (p.350) edited by Subhi Saleh

145 The *Shi'ites*, as is known, believe that their imams are infallible, but they become terribly uneasy when they encounter those narratives in which the imams are said to be just like any other human being, and that they forget and make mistakes. Al-Majlisi even confesses that: "The issue poses a real and serious problem, considering the large number of narratives confirming that the imams do actually forget..."¹⁷¹

146 The *Shi'ite's* eleventh Imam, al-Hasan al-'Askari had no son at the time of his death, but despite that and fearing that the foundations of the Shi'i *Madhhab* will fall asunder, a *Shi'ite mullah* named 'Uthman ibn Sa'id claimed that the imam actually had a son who went into hiding at the age of four and that he ('Uthman ibn Sa'id) was his deputy.

What an irony! The *Shi'ites* claim that they only accept the words of the infallible imams, but here they accept from a single ordinary and fallible person his claim on an issue so fundamental like the *imamate*.

147 The *Shi'ites* attack Marwan ibn al-Hakam and ascribe to him all evil, nonetheless we find them contradicting this, as they report in their books that al-Hasan and al-Husain (عليه السلام) used to pray behind him.¹⁷²

Moreover, we find that Mu'awiyah, the son of Marwan married Ramlah, the daughter of 'Ali (عليه السلام), as mentioned by experts on lineage.¹⁷³ Al-Walid ibn 'Abd al-Malik,

171 Bihar al-Anwar (25/351).

172 Bihar al-Anwar (10/139), and ar-Rawandi's 'an-Nawadir' (p.163).

173 Mus'ab az-Zubairi 'Nasab Quraish' (p.45), and Ibn Hazm, 'Jamharat

Marwan's grandson also married Zainab, the daughter of al-Hasan (al-Muthanna),¹⁷⁴ as he also married Nafisah the daughter of Zaid ibn al-Hasan ibn 'Ali.¹⁷⁵

148 The *Shi'ites* believe that the Imam must be an adult,¹⁷⁶ nevertheless they claim the *imamate* in respect of Muhammad ibn 'Ali the one they call (al-Jawad), who was a minor, at the death of his father 'Ali (al-Rida).

149 In a number of their tales about their so-called invisible Mahdi, they claim that at the time of his birth "A flock of birds came down from above rubbing their wings on his head, his face and other parts of his body then flew away. When his father was told this he laughed and said, "Those were angels of the sky who came down to get blessings from this baby, and they will be his helpers at the time he emerges out of his seclusion".¹⁷⁷

The question here is, why all the fear that made him enter the *sirdab* so long as the angels were his helpers?

150 Among the fundamental conditions of an imam according to the *Shi'ites*, is that he must be the eldest son of his father, and that only an imam is eligible to wash him when he dies, that the armour plate of the Prophet (ﷺ) must fit him, that he must be the most knowledgeable of all people,

Ansab al-'Arab (p.87).

174 'Nasab Quraish' (p.52), 'Jamharat Ansab al-'Arab' (p.108).

175 Ibn 'Anbata 'Umdat at-Talib Fi Ansab Ali Abi Talib (p.111) and Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd (5/34).

176 'Nasab Quraish' (p.52), 'Jamharat Ansab al-'Arab' (p.108).

177 Raudat al-Wa'izin (p.260).

that he must not enter the condition of *Janabah* (major impurity), nor should he ever have a wet dream and that he must know the *Ghaib* (the unseen)...etc.

But these conditions notwithstanding, the *Shi'ites* fell into grave contradictions later on with regards to their fulfilment in their imams, for we find that some of them were not the eldest sons of their fathers, like Musa al-Kazim and al-Hasan al-'Askari. Some of them were not washed by an imam like 'Ali Ar-Rida who was not washed by his son Muhammad al-Jawad who was only eight years at the death of his father. Musa al-Kazim was also not washed by his son 'Ali ar-Rida who was absent at that time. Even al-Husain ibn 'Ali was not given the funeral bath by his son 'Ali Zain al-'Abidin because he happened to be ill on the one hand, and was prevented from doing so by the armies of Ibn Ziyad on the other. We also find that the armour plate of the Prophet (ﷺ) did not fit some of those so-called imams, like Muhammad al-Jawad who was not more than eight years at the death of his father. His son 'Ali ibn Muhammad also died at a younger age.

We also find that some of the imams like the young ones, were not the most knowledgeable of their age, while some, like 'Ali and his two sons al-Hasan and al-Husain (عليه السلام) were mentioned explicitly in Shi'i narratives pointing that they would have wet dreams and would be subjected to major impurity. They report from the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) that he said, "It is not allowed for anyone to contract major impurity in this mosque except myself, 'Ali, Fatimah, al-Hasan and al-Husain"¹⁷⁸

178 'Uyun Akhbar ar-Rida (2/60).

As for the knowledge of the Unseen, it is a matter the refutation of which does not deserve any effort otherwise we wouldn't have found that some of the Imams died as a result of being poisoned, for had they any knowledge of the unseen they would have known that the poison had been put in their food or drink.

151 Another condition the *Shi'ites* stipulate in respect of the Imam is that he must be explicitly mentioned by a *nass* (religious text) that he would be an imam.

Had that condition been true and rational enough, we wouldn't have found the enormous contradictions between their various sects on the issue of *imamah*. Each sect argues and claims that they have a *nass* on their particular imam. What makes one sect better and more deserving to the truth than the others in this respect? For example, the *Kaisaniyyah* denomination of the *Shi'ites* claim that the imam after 'Ali (عليه السلام) was his own son Muhammad ibn al-Hanafyyah and so on.¹⁷⁹

152 Some *Shi'ites* slander 'A'ishah (عليها السلام) and accuse her of that dirty crime she was accused of by the slanderers, Allah forbid. We here say to them: If the case is as you claim, why didn't the Prophet (ﷺ) punish her with the relevant legal punishment knowing certainly that he was the one that once said: "I swear by Allah, if Fatimah the daughter

179 On the death of every assumed imam the *Shi'ites* have never agreed on a successor, and on each occasion they have differed so widely that this has caused fundamental discord amongst them and split them into further small denominations as a result of which each party claims that there is a religious text in favour of their assumed imam. (Translator).

of Muhammad would steal, I would surely have cut off her hand".¹⁸⁰

Why didn't 'Ali execute the legal punishment on her, despite the fact that he was famous for his strong mind and that he feared no one in the cause of Allah? Why did al-Hasan not punish her at the time he became the caliph?

153 The *Shi'ites* claim that knowledge of all things is left to the imams and that they inherited books and plenty of information which no one, apart from them, is endowed with. They have what the *Shi'ites* call *sahifah al-Jami'ah*, *Kitab 'Ali*, *al-'Abitah*, *Diwan as-Shi'ah* and *al-Jafr*, and they believe that these imaginary and fraudulent books contain all that is needed by people.

Ironically, were any of these books extant, the face of history itself would have changed, and their assumed imams would have achieved their aim of gaining political control. The series of tribulations that befell them would not have happened and none of them would have been murdered or poisoned, as they claim, nay their invisible imam would not have hidden himself and remained in the *sirdab* afraid of being killed, instead he would have moved around like any other free citizen of his country.

154 We also say to them, where are all these books today? What is their hidden imam waiting for to make them public? Are people in need of them at all in anything to do with their religion? If they do actually need them, why would they be deprived of their source of guidance for

180 Al-Bukhari

more than eleven centuries, i.e. from the day the so-called imam disappeared? What wrong did all these generations commit to deserve being deprived of this treasure? On the other hand, if people are not in need of these books, why all these claims? Why are the *Shi'ites* turned away from their original source of guidance, i.e. the Qura'n and the teachings of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ)?

155 The *Shi'ites* mention in their books that al-Husain's march to Kufa and its people, and their disappointment and abandonment of him and consequently killing him were the factors that led the whole people but three to become apostates. This means that had he known what would happen in the future, he wouldn't have marched to Kufa.

156 They claim that the purpose of their twelfth imam going into hiding was his fear of being killed. We ask here, why the imams before him were not killed even though they lived under the caliphs of their own times as fully grown up men. Why would he be killed while he was only a small kid?

157 The *Shi'ites* claim that they only rely on *hadiths* that were 'authentically reported through the *Ahl al-Bait*'. This is sheer deception, because it implies that they consider some of their so-called twelve imams just like the Messenger (ﷺ) – the infallible who only speaks of what has been revealed to him, and whose statement carries the same weight as Allah's statement. That is why you hardly find sayings of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) in their vast literature, because they see no need for that and are content with what they believe is reported through the *Ahl al-Bait*. In actual sense it is not even true that they rely

on what is reported through (all of) the *Ahl al-Bait*. They rather accept what is reported from their imams only, neglecting the progeny of al-Hasan (ﷺ), for example.

158 We also say to them: You people claim to rely on what is reported through your so called 'imams among the *Ahl al-Bait*', and it is undoubtedly known that none of those 'imams' but 'Ali met the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) at an age of near adolescence such that his reports from him could be considered reliable and acceptable. How, then, could 'Ali (ﷺ) report from the Messenger the whole of his *sunnah* to the following generations? How could that be possible when we witness in history, and as confessed by you, that sometimes the Messenger used to leave him behind to take care of Madinah or send him on some expedition, such that no one could claim that 'Ali had never left the Prophet (ﷺ) throughout his lifetime.

Again, how could it be possible for 'Ali to give exact and precise accounts of what happened in the personal life of the Messenger (ﷺ) in his house, particularly those very private affairs that only his wives would be able to know and report?

Therefore, it is totally impossible for 'Ali (ﷺ) alone to report to you all the *sunnah* of the Messenger (ﷺ).

159 Again, we are all witness to the fact that most Muslim countries received the knowledge reported from the Messenger (ﷺ) through chains of narration other than that of 'Ali (ﷺ), nay most of the companions who delivered the knowledge of Islam from him were not among the *Ahl al-Bait*. For instance, the Messenger (ﷺ)

sent As'ad ibn Zurarah (ؓ) to Madinah to call people to Islam and teach the Ansar (people of Madinah) the Qur'an and the basics of the religion of Islam. He also sent al-'Ala' ibn al-Hadrami to Bahrain for the same purpose, as he sent Mu'adh ibn Jabal and Abu Musa Al-'Ash'ari (ؓ) to Yemen, and 'Attab ibn Usaïd to Makkah.

So, the *Shi'ites* claim that no one conveyed any message from the Prophet (ﷺ) but from among the *Ahl al-Bait*, is a matter very much up in the air.

160 The *Shi'ites* confess in their reliable sources that the knowledge of the lawful and the unlawful matters of religion and Hajj rites only reached them through Abu Ja'far al-Baqir. So this means that nothing of 'Ali's reports reached them on the aforementioned issues, and that their predecessors only worshipped Allah with what was reported by the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ)!

Shi'ite books report that: "The *Shi'ites*, before the time of Abu Ja'far were unaware of either the Hajj rites, or the lawful and unlawful matters of religion, up to the time when Abu Ja'far came and introduced and explained to them issues on these topics. From then on people were in dire need of the *Ahl al-Bait* and their knowledge, after living in a condition in which they were the ones who needed knowledge from people".¹⁸¹

181 *Usul al-Kafi* (2/20), *Tafsir al-'Ayyashi* (1/252-253), *al-Burhan* (1/386) and *Rijal al-Kishshi* (p.425).

161 The *Shi'ites* contradict themselves when they regard the person who claimed to have seen their assumed Mahdi as just and truthful. Their *mullah* al-Mamaqani, speaking about a particular person who made such a claim, says: "The man had the honour of seeing the Mahdi, may Allah hasten his appearance and make us as sacrifice for him from anything bad, after his disappearance, so we take that as a necessary and unavoidable proof of the man's high esteem in being just".¹⁸²

But why don't they give the same position to a person who actually saw the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), knowing undoubtedly that he was far better than their so-called *hujjah* (al-Mahdi)?

162 Another contradiction is the *Shi'ites'* rejection of the reports of whoever rejects any of their so-called Imams, a pretext based on which they reject the reports of all the companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ). But we find that they don't give the same treatment to the opinions and reports of some past *Shi'ite* sects that did not accept the imamate of some particular imams. Their scholar al-Hurr al-'Amili had pinpointed that the imami *Shi'ites* accept the reports and *hadiths* of the Futaihiyyah sect¹⁸³, and the narratives of the 'al-Waqifiyyah'¹⁸⁴ and 'An-Nawusiyyah'¹⁸⁵ sects. All these three sects reject the *imamah* of some of

182 Tanqih al-Maqal (1/211).

183 The followers of 'Abdullahi 'al-Aftah' ibn Ja'far as-Sadiq

184 That party of the *Shi'ites* who stopped at Musa the son of Ja'far and do not accept the *Imamate* of all the Imams after him.

185 The followers of a man called Nawus or Ibn Nawus, who believe that Ja'far as-Sadiq did not die and that he is the Mahdi.

the Shi'i twelve Imams, but despite that they consider a number of their reporters as reliable and accept their narratives,¹⁸⁶ a gesture they couldn't offer in favour of the companions of the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ).

163 A large number of *Shi'ite* scholars believe that Al-Kulaini's book '*Al-Kafi*' contains sound, weak and fabricated *hadiths*, even though it is one of the widely accepted facts among the *Shi'ites* that this book has been shown to their invisible Mahdi and was asked about it and he was reported to have said: "Sufficient it is for our sect (the *Shi'ites*)".¹⁸⁷

If this is the case, why didn't the Imam reject the fabricated *hadiths* abound in that book?

164 In his book *Misbah al-Faqih*, the Shi'i scholar al-Hamdani says: "The acceptance of the *ijma'* (consensus of the Ulama) as a binding source of law is only based on the opinions of later (*Shi'ite*) scholars, and not on the agreement of all scholars. There has never been an era in which all the scholars agreed on this. Consensus is only based on forming a conjecture about the opinion of the invisible Mahdi."¹⁸⁸

186 See, for example: Rijal al-Kishshi (pp.563, 565, 570, 612, 616, 597, 615).

187 Husain 'Ali's introduction to the book *al-Kafi* (p. 25), al-Khuwansari's Raudat al-Jannat (6/109), and Muhammad Sadiq as-Sadr's 'Shi'ah' (p.122). The word *al-Kafi* means 'the sufficient'.

188 Meaning that, according to the *Shi'ites*, an *Ijma'* is accepted and duly considered '*hujjab*' when the scholars, based on mere conjecture, believe that the opinion they agree upon is the exact and real opinion of their invisible Imam. See: *Misbah al-Faqih* (p.436) and '*al-Ijtihad Wa at-Taqlid* (p.17).

So, the opinion of their so-called invisible Imam in support of the consensus is only known through conjecture and assumption. The *Shi'ites* are so inconsistent that they consider reliable and acceptable their own conjectures while they regard the consensus of the *salaf* unacceptable!

165 The *Shi'ites* do confess that one of their renowned scholars by name 'Ibn Babawaih al-Qummi, the author of one of their four most reliable books *Man La Yahduruh al-Faqih* 'claims that there is a consensus on a particular matter, but at the same time we find him claiming another consensus totally opposite to it on the same matter'.¹⁸⁹ One of their scholars even asserted in this regard that: "How can one be reliable and trustworthy in what he reports if this is his method of claiming consensus?".¹⁹⁰

166 One astonishing thing about the *Shi'ites* is that if they differ on any matter and one of the two opinions is known to belong to a particular scholar while the other is anonymous, they choose the anonymous one as the correct and preferred opinion, because they assume that it may be the opinion of their infallible Imam.

One of their *mullahs*, al-Hurr al-'Amili, even strongly criticized this approach, saying that: "The most astonishing thing is their acceptance of an anonymous opinion as a condition! Where is the proof to substantiate it? And how

189 Al-Turaihi, 'Jami' al-Maqal Fima Yata'allahu Bi Ahwal al-Hadith Wa ar-Rijal' (p.15).

190 Ibid.

do we attain certainty or even a relative assumption that it is the opinion of the infallible?"¹⁹¹

167 The Shi'i scholar, al-Majlisi says: "Facing the grave is inevitable even if it happens to be not in the direction of the *Qiblah*",¹⁹² that is, when they pray the two *rak'ats* of visiting their graves.

The surprising thing is that their reliable books report from their assumed imams of the *Ahl al-Bait* that taking graves as places of prayer is prohibited, but their scholars try to explain away those statements and claim that they have been uttered by the imams out of *taqiyyah*, as they usually do on any issue that is against their vested interests.

168 The *Shi'ites* incessantly regurgitate the so-called *hadith* of Ghadir and more particularly the Prophet's saying: 'I remind you of Allah about my household', but they forget that they are the first to go against this Prophetic command when they bear enmity toward a large majority of the *Ahl al-Bait*.

169 It is said to the *Shi'ites*: Had the companions hidden the issue of the claimed nass on 'Ali's leadership, they would have hidden the large amount of narratives in which his virtues are mentioned, and would not have reported any of them, and this is against the true reality of things. Therefore, had there been any such thing it would have been reported. That is because the pronouncement of an explicit *nass* on the issue of the caliphate is a very serious

191 From 'Muqtabas al-Athar' (3/63).

192 Bihar Al-Anwar (101/369).

and crucial aspect which deserves to be made public, and had such public knowledge been made of a great event like that all, friends and foes, would have been aware of it.

170 The *Shi'ites* report that al-Hasan al-'Askari, the father of their much-awaited Mahdi had ordered that the story of the 'awaited Mahdi' be hidden to all but pious confidants (of their faith). But we find that they contradicted this and went against the order by assuming that whoever does not know the imam is actually worshipping other than Allah, and if he dare dies in such a situation he dies as an infidel and a hypocrite.¹⁹³

171 As to the *Shi'ites'* claim that Allah has increased the lifespan of their awaited Mahdi hundreds of years for the benefit of the world, we say, if Allah would ever increase the lifespan of someone for the benefit of the world He would have increased that of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ).

172 The *Shi'ites* do not accept the assertion of Ja'far, the brother of al-Hasan al'Askari (the father of their so-called invisible Mahdi) that his brother al-Hasan left no child, because they claim that he (Ja'far) was not infallible.¹⁹⁴ But ironically, they accept the claim of one 'Uthman ibn Sa'id that al-Hasan actually had a son despite the fact that 'Uthman was not infallible either. What a contradiction?.

173 One of the *Shi'ites'* widely known doctrines is the belief in the tina (holy clay) as previously mentioned in the introduction to this book. The main idea behind this is that

193 *Usul Al-Kafi* (1/181-184).

194 See: Al-Ghaibah (p.106-107)

Allah, as the *Shi'ites* believe, has created the *Shi'ites* from a special clay, and created the followers of the *Sunnah* from a different one, and that a sort of mixture of the two types of clay did occur in a special way. As such they believe that whatever sin or crime committed by the *Shi'ites* is seen to be as a result of their being influenced negatively by the clay of the followers of the *Sunnah*. On the other hand, whatever goodness, piety and trustworthiness found in the followers of the *Sunnah* must be from the influence of the *Shi'ite* 'holy' clay. And finally, on the day of resurrection, the followers of the *Sunnah* will be made to bear all the sins and crimes committed by the *Shi'ites*, while their good deeds will be transferred in favour of the *Shi'ites*.

Here the *Shi'ites* forget that this newly concocted theory is totally against the teachings of their *madhhab* on the issue of *Qadr* (Divine Predestination) and its relation to the deeds of the servants. This is because according to this idea the servant has no choice or will of his own, rather all his actions are determined, and more particularly, the predetermination has been made by virtue of nothing but the clay from which he is created. This idea, from another angle, is contrary to the Shi'i *madhhab* on the issue, which says that man has perfect and free will over his deeds and he is the 'creator' of his own deeds just like the *Mu'tazilahs* profess.

174 The *Shi'ites* do mention that the Ansar (people of Madinah) loved 'Ali ibn Abi Talib very much and that many of them were with him in the battle of Siffin. We ask them, if that was the case, why did they give their allegiance to Abu

Bakr on the caliphate instead of 'Ali? Here you will never get a convincing answer.

The view of the Ansar, and the Muhajirun before them, was far from and better than all that, for the issue of the caliphate, in their view, is different from that of personal sentiments towards the household and relatives of the Prophet (ﷺ). That is why we find that the same Shi'ite sources that report the narratives claiming that the Ansar were on 'Ali's side in the battle of Siffin are the same sources that report those narratives condemning them as infidels who turned on their backs on the day of *Saqifah*.

How ironic a scale used here in measuring and assessing the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ)!!! Whenever they are reported to have been on 'Ali's side on any particular matter, they are regarded the best people on earth, but if they happen to be on the side of someone assumed to be one of 'Ali's foes, or any side other than his, they are considered infidels, unscrupulous and hypocrites.

If they say, we consider them infidels because they denied the plain and explicit command of the Prophet (ﷺ) that 'Ali should be the caliph immediately after him, we say to them, don't you claim that the *hadith* of Ghadir (in which you assume the plain command was made) was *Mutawatir* and that hundreds of the companions reported it? Where, then, is the denial?¹⁹⁵ That is because, logically, if I proclaim that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: 'For

195 How could the same people who reported a narrative be accused of denying it, more especially that no one could have reported it but them? (Translator).

whomever I am *maula*, 'Ali is also a *maula*', how can someone understand, here, that I deny this same statement?

If it is said that they only denied the interpretation not the wording of the statement, we say, who says that your interpretation of the meaning of this *hadith* is correct and true? Do you claim to understand better than the companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) who lived those wonderful moments and heard the *hadith* from him with their physical ears? Or do you claim a better knowledge of the Arabic language than them to the extent that you grasped from the *hadith* what they failed to get?.¹⁹⁶

175 (On the issue of the *Shi'ites'* doctrine that the Qur'an was altered) we deal with two opposing parties:

One of the parties speak ill of the Book of Allah, claiming that it is not complete and that it had been changed and tampered with. One of the proponents of this idea is an-Nuri at-Tabarsi, the author of '*al-Mustadrak*' (i.e. *Mustadrak al-Wasa'il*), one of the eight most reliable books of *hadith* of the Twelver *Shi'ites*. This man had written a book he called *Fasl al-Khitab Fi Ithbat Tahrif Kitab Rabb al-Arbab* (The Decisive Opinion on the Proof of the Alteration of the Book of the Lord of lords). In the book, he says: 'Among the many proofs that the Qur'an has been altered is that it appears eloquent in some paragraphs so much so that it reaches the level of posing a challenge, while in some other paragraphs it appears absurd'.¹⁹⁷

196 See: Muhammad Salim al-Khidr, 'Thumma Absartu al-Haqiqah', (p. 291-292).

197 '*Fasl al-Khitab Fi Ithbat Tahrif Kitab Rabb al-Arbab*', p.211

Among them also is the Shi'i scholar 'Adnan al-Bahrani, who says: '(This idea is supported by) the enormous amount of narratives that reach beyond the level of *Tawatur* and which we need not mention here. Moreover, the belief in the fact that the Qur'an was altered is widely known among the two parties, in addition to its being an issue indisputable among the sahabah and the tabi'un. Nay, it was a matter of consensus among the Shi'i sect and one of the necessary fundamentals of the (Shi'i) *Madhhab* which is contained in a great number of its narratives'.¹⁹⁸

Another scholar, Yusuf al-Bahrani, says: 'These narratives obviously carry clear evidence and eloquent statements on the opinion we have chosen. Were these evidences to be discredited, despite their enormous number and popularity, the entire *Shari'ah* law would deserve to be discredited. Because the origin of both¹⁹⁹ is the same, so also the chain of narrators and the narrators and scholars themselves are the same. I swear that the opposite opinion (i.e. the belief that the Qur'an is intact and totally complete and unaltered) is nothing but a way of giving the benefit of the doubt to those oppressive leaders thereby giving the wrong pretext that they did not betray the issue of the *imamah* (caliphate), even though their betrayal of the other trust - which is more grievous on the religion - was very much clear'.²⁰⁰

198 'Mashariq ash-Shumus ad-Durriyyah' (p.126).

199 'The assumed narratives on the alteration of the Qur'an as narrated in the *Shi'I* books, and the *Shari'ah* law.

200 Yusuf al-Bahrani, 'Al-Durar al-Najafiyyah, p.298

This party clearly defames and speaks ill of the Qur'an claiming that it has been altered. As for the other party, that is, the party of the companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), the only 'crime' they committed and over which the *Shi'ites* will never forgive them was that they gave their allegiance to Abu Bakr (رضي الله عنه) to be the caliph immediately after the death of the Prophet (ﷺ) instead of 'Ali (رضي الله عنه).

The strongest excuse the *Shi'ite* scholars plead in their effort to defend the first party that defames the Qur'an (i.e. the *Shi'ites*) is for them to say, 'they have made a mistake', or 'this is an *ijtihad* from them; they have an excuse in their explanation of the issue, although we do not agree with their view'. How I wish I knew when the issue of safeguarding or altering the Qur'an was reduced to a mere matter of *ijtihad*. What *ijtihad* is there in the statement of this evildoer who said the Qur'an contains verses that are absurd or stupid? What a terrible thing!!!

Let's take an example of the way the *Shi'ite* scholars treat this issue of the alleged alteration of the Qur'an.

As-Sayyid Ali al-Milani – one of the most senior *Shi'ite* scholars of this day -, in his book named '*The Non-alteration of the Qur'an*', p.34, in his effort to defend Mirza Nuri at-Tabarsi, says: 'al-Mirza Nuri At-Tabarsi is one of the greatest scholars of *hadith*. We do respect al-Mirza Nuri. He is one of our greatest scholars and we cannot attack him in any way, and that is not even permissible,

may it is forbidden. He is a great *Muhaddith* among our scholars'.²⁰¹

176 Allah, the Most Exalted, says:

{ "Follow what has been revealed to you from your Lord, and do not follow besides Him any allies." } (Surah Al-A'raf: 3).

This verse explicitly condemns following anyone other than the Messenger of Allah. As for the issue of *imamah*, the need for it is only for the imam to execute Allah's laws that came to us, not for him to bring to people what they do not need in the knowledge of the religion brought by the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ).²⁰² We do find that when 'Ali (عليه السلام) was called upon to resort to the Qur'an as judge on the issue of arbitration he gave in and even stated that taking the Qur'an as judge in disputes is the right thing to do. So, if this action from him is right, then this is our opinion as well. But if he is seen as doing the wrong thing, then one must strongly assert that, this is not befitting him. Had resorting to the judgement of the Qur'an in the presence of the imam been forbidden, 'Ali would have said at that time: Why would you call for the judgement of the Qur'an while you know that I am the imam who conveys on behalf of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ)?

If they say, so long as the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) is dead, there must be an imam who will convey the message on his

201 Thumma Absart al-Haqiqah, p.294

202 The Arabic text here in the original is somehow corrupt as such the meaning is not very clear. The statement is originally from Ibn Hazm's al-Fisal (4/95), and it appears the author reported it as it is with the same ambiguity in meaning.

behalf, we say, this is totally wrong, for it is a mere claim devoid of any substantial proof. What the people would need from the Messenger (ﷺ) are his own statements and personal conveyances of the message to the whole ummah, to those who were present with him, those who were absent and those who would come after him. This is because, if the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) was silent on anything to do with the deen, then there is nothing in his personal self or body to make that statement. So what is needed is his own statement that will remain till the end of time and which will be conveyed to people the world over.

Furthermore, were the *Shi'ites'* wishful thinking for the need of an immortal Imam to be realized, the aim of such idea would have been defeated by the fact that there are thousands of people living in remote parts of the world physically far away from the Imam. And (being a human being) he would have no way at all of reaching and physically witnessing all people living in all parts of the world, the poor among them, the weak, the women, the sick and those who are busy or occupied by thier personal affairs of earning a living, and who would be lost if neglected. Therefore, there is no way but through conveying the imam's words and law to all people.

And if delivering on behalf of the Imam is inevitable, then following what has been conveyed from the Messenger of Allah is more deserving than that claimed to have been reported from any other person inferior to him, the Imam inclusive, and this is something the *Shi'ites* cannot avoid.²⁰³

203 Ibn Hazm, al-Fisal Fi l-Milal Wa l-Ahwa Wa n-Nihal (4/159-160).

177 There are a number of *Shi'ites'* sound and authentic narratives in which the Imams are reported to have cursed a group of liars on whose reports the whole Shi'i religion is based, mentioning each of them by name and rebuking them. These reports the *Shi'ite* scholars do not accept (because if they accept them they would become among the *Ahlus Sunnah* and denounce their deviant thoughts). In such situations, they resort to *taqiyyah* in order to confront this sharp censure of their narrators.²⁰⁴ To any sensible person, this is just another way of rejecting the reports from the imam, and if one who rejects the statement of an imam would be regarded an infidel in the Shi'i religion, they would all be infidels by their rejection of such reports.

One of their contemporary elders and scholars – Muhammad Rida²⁰⁵ al-Muzaffar – had confessed that *Shi'ite* sources do actually report a number of reports in which most of their narrators are being cursed and sharply rebuked by the Imams. In his comment on the reports rebuking and cursing Hisham ibn Salim al-Jawaliqi, he says: 'Reports have come speaking ill of him, just like it came in respect of other trusted and reliable narrators among the great adherents to the cause of the *Ahlul Bait* and their followers. The answer given with regard to these reports is known²⁰⁶ [meaning that the usual excuse they give in such situations is *taqiyyah*]. He then said: 'How can

204 That is by claiming that the imams only cursed and rebuked those narrators out of *taqiyyah*.

205 That is what the author mentioned here, but the correct name is Muhammad al-Husain al-Muzaffar as in the next footnote.

206 Muhammad al-Husain al-Muzaffar, 'al-Imam as-Sadiq, (p.178).

a curse be accepted in respect of those great personalities? Was the true religion able to gain ground and the cause of the *Ahl al-Bait* able to be made public if not for the clear-cut proofs reported by way of those personalities, upon which the religion was built?'.²⁰⁷

Note how these people chauvinistically defend those whom the so-called imams of the *Ahl al-Bait* had cursed and strongly condemned, thereby rejecting the reports narrated from the scholars of *Ahl al-Bait* in *Shi'ites* books, which speak ill of and warn people against them. By this, it is as if they are accusing the *Ahl al-Bait* of lying, nay, they accept what those liars say, because they assume that the statements reported from the *Ahl al-Bait* in which they curse them were only said out of *taqiyyah* not in good faith. Hence, it is clear that they do not follow the *Ahl al-Bait* in all their statements that are in agreement with those of the Muslim ummah. They rather, follow the steps of their enemies and accept their sayings, then they resort to *taqiyyah* in dispelling and rejecting the sayings of the Imams.

178 It is generally known by all and sundry, through a significant number of reports that Abu Bakr, Umar and 'Uthman were the closest associates of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), and the relation between them was so special that he was in-law to all the three of them.²⁰⁸ He loved them so much, and used to praise them.

207 Ibid:

208 He took for marriage 'A'ishah and Hafsa, the daughters of Abu Bakr and 'Umar respectively, and he gave his two daughters Ruqayyah and Umm Kulthum in marriage to 'Uthman (may Allah be pleased with all of them).

Here, one of two things must be true, either that all these three people were thoroughly upright in their religion both internally and outwardly during the life of the Prophet and after that, or that they were evil and not on the right path both before and after the Prophet (ﷺ). If they were bad and on the wrong path despite this close and special relationship with the Prophet, then one of two things must be right. Either the Prophet (ﷺ) was ignorant of their true position, or that his dealings with them were based on sheer sycophancy and hypocrisy from his side (God forbid). And ascribing any of these two stances to the Messenger of Allah is the most wicked vilification and worst slander against his person (ﷺ).²⁰⁹ As they saying goes:

If you are unaware (of the gravity of your offence),
that is indeed a misfortune;

But if you are fully aware, then it is a greater misfortune

If, on the other hand, they are seen to have gone astray after their steadfastness in Islam, then this means that Allah had disappointed him and neglected an important issue like guiding the best of his ummah and the most senior of his companions, despite the fact that He had promised,

209 This also emphasizes the fact that the hadith in which the Prophet (ﷺ) mentioned that some people would be driven away from his haud (pond) because they have changed does not refer to them in any way. For had he had them in mind he would not have praised them, married their daughters, taken them as close associates and promised them an abode in the Paradise. But as the *Shi'ites* always browse through the Islamic sources desperately in search of anything that vilifies the companions, they blindly use this hadith as an argument against these pious servants of Allah and the closest associates whom Allah had chosen to befriend his beloved Messenger. (Translator).

time and again, to help him convey his message and make his deen overcome all other religions. How could his most senior and close associates become apostates? This and other issues are the dirtiest parts of the Shi'i religion through which they vilify the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ). Just like al-Imam Abu Zur'ah had said: "These people (meaning the *Shi'ites*) only want to defame and attack the person of the Messenger, so that people will say: 'he was a bad man surrounded by bad people; had he been a good person his close associates would have been so'".

179 The *Shi'ite* doctrine of declaring the *Sahabah* infidels and apostates must imply that 'Ali (عليه السلام) is included, for his failure to execute Allah's order (of him being the imam). It also implies that the belief that this divine law of Islam has been transmitted through an uncorrupted and reliable chain of narrators is very much up in the air, nay it implies that this *Shari'ah* is totally null and void, because it has been reported by apostates. This eventually leads to discrediting the Qur'an, because it has only come to us through Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman and their likes. And this is, of course, the aim of the person that instituted this Shi'i ideology.

180 The *Shi'ites* say that "The doctrine of *Imamah* is necessary because the imam serves as a deputy of the Messenger of Allah in the preservation of the Islamic law and making it easy for people to live as Muslims on the righteous path, and in preserving the *Shari'ah* from any addition and deduction'.²¹⁰ They also say that 'It is inevitable to have an imam who is appointed by Allah, for whom the world is in

dire need, and whose appointment causes no corruption or evil'.²¹¹ They further assert that *imamah* 'is necessary because it is seen as a sort of benevolence, and it is so because people tend to prosper more and become farther from evil whenever they have a leader whom they obey and who guides them, deters the wrongdoer amongst them from his wrongdoing, leads them to anything good and prevents them from falling into evil and corruption. And this is the meaning of benevolence'.²¹²

In response to this we say, none of your so-called imams - apart from 'Ali²¹³ - held a position of public leadership either in the religious or in the worldly and political sense. They were not able to deter and prevent the wrongdoers from their wrongdoing, nor were they able to lead people to anything good or prevent them from falling into any evil. Why, then, do you claim in their respect such things that are nothing but sheer wishful thinking that had never seen the light of day. This surely indicates that they were never imams, according to your understanding of the word, if, at all, you will give yourselves the chance to reason, because the benevolence you believe to come from an imam has never been realized through any one of them.

181 It has been reported in *Nahj Al-Balaghah* that 'Ali (ﷺ) used to invoke Allah saying: "O Allah! Forgive me that which you know better than I. If I happen to return and commit it again, repeat your forgiveness for me. O, Allah!

211 Minhaj al-Karamah (p.72-73).

212 A'ayan ash-Shi'ah (1/2/p.6).

213 And his son al-Hasan

Forgive me what I promise but fail to fulfill. O, Allah! Forgive what I pronounce with my tongue in my worship of you, and with which my heart gets accustomed to. O, Allah! Forgive the wrong glances of my eyes, the bad language of my words, the forgetfulness of my mind and the slips of my tongue".²¹⁴

Here, 'Ali (عليه السلام) asks Allah to forgive his sins including unintentional mistakes and others of its sorts, and this negates his assumed infallibility.²¹⁵

182 The *Shi'ites* assume that the prime duty of all commissioned prophets was to proclaim and call to the wilayah of 'Ali (عليه السلام),²¹⁶ and that Allah has taken a covenant from the Prophets over the wilayah of 'Ali.²¹⁷ Nay, the issue according to them goes to the extent that their scholar, at-Tahrani assumes that the belief in and the acceptance of the wilayah of 'Ali 'has been demanded from all created objects, such that whichever of them accepts it becomes good and suitable, and whichever denies it becomes bad.²¹⁸

214 Nahj al-Balaghah (Ibn Abi al-Hadid's commentary) (p.303).

215 This will be understood more clearly if we call to mind the meaning of infallibility of the imams according to Shi'i philosophy the mention of which has passed in previous pages. Infallibility means an imam does not commit any sin both major and minor, and does not forget a thing nor does he make mistakes. (Translator).

216 See: Bihar al-Anwar (11/60), and 'al-Ma'alim al-Zulfa (p.303).

217 'Al-Ma'alim al-Zulfa (p.303).

218 At-Tahrani, 'Wada'i' an-Nubuwwah' (p.155). This reminds me of what one of their contemporary mullahs (Husain al-Fuhaid) said on one of their religious occasions, that even in fruits (like oranges, water melons etc.) there are lovers and enemies of *Ahl al-Bait*, and that any of them that tastes good loves *Ahl al-Bait*, and any that tastes bad is an enemy of *Ahl al-Bait*.

We say to the *Shi'ites*, the mission of all prophets was to call people to *tauhid* (the worship of Allah alone, without associating any partner with him), and full sincerity in that worship, not to the belief that 'Ali is their leader or imam as you claim. Allah, the Most Exalted, says:

{And We sent not before you any messenger except that we revealed to him that "There is no deity except Me, so worship Me"} (Surah Al-Anbiya': 25).

We further ask you, if the so-called wilayah of 'Ali was written in the books of all previous prophets as you claim, why are the *Shi'ites* the only people to report that, nay no one has knowledge of it except them? Why are the adherents of other religions unaware of that? We do find that most of them have accepted Islam but made no mention of this assumed wilayah. Why is it not mentioned even in the Qur'an which supersedes those previous books?

183 Did the imams practice *mut'ah* (temporary marriage)? And who were their sons from those marriages?

184 The *Shi'ites* claim that the imams know everything that has passed and that would come in the future, and nothing is hidden from them, and that 'Ali (ﷺ) is the gate of knowledge. (If that is so) how could 'Ali (ﷺ) be ignorant of the ruling of '*madhiyy*'²¹⁹ and he had to send someone to the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) for him to ask about that matter on his behalf?

219 The prostate fluid occurring from arousal but before ejaculation

185 The *Sahabah's* major crime in the sight of the *Shi'ites* is their deviation from the wilayah of 'Ali and their failure to accept him as caliph (after the Prophet immediately). For this, according to the *Shi'ites*, they lost their uprightness and reputation. But why don't they treat other *Shi'ite* sects, like '*al-Futahiyyah*' and '*al-Waqifiyyah*', who also reject some of their so-called imams with the same token? Instead, they even accept their reports and regard them upright.²²⁰ What kind of contradiction is this?

186 As outlined previously all *Shi'ite* sources are unanimous on the validity, on the part of the imam and others, to resort to *taqiyyah*, that is, to express the opposite of what he has in his mind, rather, he may even lie. And whoever uses *taqiyyah* can never be infallible because he must definitely lie, which is a sin.

187 Al-Kulaini reports that some among the followers of 'Ali (ﷺ) had demanded that he redress what has been corrupted by the caliphs before him, but he rejected the idea arguing that he was afraid his army would divide and desert him.²²¹ This is in spite of the fact that the issues over which they accuse the caliphs before him include their alleged violations of the Qur'an and *Sunnah*. Is 'Ali's overlooking of those matters in line with his assumed 'infallibility'?

220 See for example: the books '*Rijal al-Kisshi*' (p.27; 219; 445; 465), '*Rijal an-Najashi*' (p.28; 53; 76; 86; 95; 139), and al-Ardabili's '*Jami' ar-Ruwat*' (1/413).

221 Al-Kulaini '*al-Raudah*' (p.29).

188 'Umar (ﷺ) appointed six persons to deliberate and choose the caliph from among themselves after his death. Three of them ceded the position, and later on 'Abd Ar-Rahman ibn 'Auf also gave up, leaving 'Uthman and 'Ali (ﷺ). Why didn't 'Ali mention from the on set and before the deliberations that he was mandated by the Prophet (ﷺ) to be the caliph immediately after him? Was he afraid of any of these people after the death of 'Umar (ﷺ)?

